



**STATE OF MARYLAND
OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENT
AND FAMILY PRESERVATION RESOURCE PLAN**

FY 2012

Prepared by:



Governor's Office for Children
Promoting the well-being of Maryland's children

*On behalf of
the Children's Cabinet*

*Submitted on
December 14, 2012*

Acknowledgements

The following persons provided invaluable assistance with this report:

Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

Susan Bradley, Mental Hygiene Administration
Eric English, Mental Hygiene Administration
Tom Merrick, Mental Hygiene Administration
Bette Anne Mobley, Developmental Disabilities Administration
John Reynolds, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration
William Rusinko, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration
Sequaya Tasker, Developmental Disabilities Administration
Al Zachik, Mental Hygiene Administration

Department of Human Resources

David Ayer, Social Services Administration
Linda Carter, Social Services Administration
Carnitra White, Social Services Administration

Department of Juvenile Services

Bill Drollinger, Fiscal Planning and Management
John Irvine, Research and Evaluation
Michael Ito, Behavioral Health and Victim Services
Lakshmi Iyengar, Research and Evaluation
Melissa Liszewski, Fiscal Planning and Management

Governor's Office for Children

Patricia Arriaza, Interagency Initiatives
Deborah Donohue, Principal Counsel
Scott Finkelsen, Finance and Operations
Kim Malat, Interim Executive Director
Steven Schreiber-Stahl, Interagency Initiatives
Mark Scott, Interagency Initiatives
Antoinette Thomas, Information Technology

Maryland State Department of Education

Cynthia Amirault, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services
Marcella Franczkowski, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services
Alice Harris, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services
Jodi King, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services
Jeff Miller, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

For further information or copies of this report, please visit the Governor's Office for Children's website at www.goc.maryland.gov.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Section I: Introduction & Overview	1
Background.....	1
Data Collection Methodology & Considerations.....	2
Report Overview.....	5
Section II: Statewide Summary & Highlights	10
Overview.....	10
Out-of-Home Placement (OOHP) Summary Data: State of Maryland	10
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR) OVERVIEW.....	29
DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS) OVERVIEW	45
Section III: Family Home Settings	61
Overview.....	61
Family Home Settings Summary	62
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)	63
DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS)	76
Section IV: Community-Based Residential Programs.....	82
Overview.....	82
Community-Based Residential Placements Summary.....	84
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)	85
DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS)	96
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES ADMINISTRATION (DDA).....	103
Section V: Non-Community Based Residential Placements	112
Overview.....	112
Non-Community Based Residential Placements Summary.....	113
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)	114
DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS)	120
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE ALCOHOL AND DRUG AND ABUSE ADMINISTRATION (ADAA).....	131
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE MENTAL HYGIENE ADMINISTRATION (MHA).....	139
MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (MSDE).....	150
Section VI: Hospitalizations	160
Overview.....	160
Hospitalizations Summary	160
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)	161
Section VII: Maryland School for the Blind and Maryland School for the Deaf	165
Section VIII: Family Preservation Services.....	167

APPENDIX 1: Capacity Utilization by Placement Category	182
Family Home Settings.....	183
Community-Based Residential Placements	192
Non-Community Based Residential Placements	220
Hospitalizations.....	226
Unknown.....	226
APPENDIX 2: Placement by Jurisdiction by Placement Subcategory.....	227

Section I: Introduction & Overview

Background

The State is responsible for linking children served in out-of-home care with placements and services that meet their needs. It is imperative that the State conducts ongoing, unified and comprehensive reviews of the placements and services provided to the children placed in its care. The purpose of the Out-of-Home Placement (OOHP) and Family Preservation Resource Plan (Report) is to document the State's capacity for and utilization of out-of-home placements, analyze the cost associated with out-of-home placement, facilitate an evaluation of Statewide family preservation programs, and identify areas of need across Maryland. The Report fulfills the requirement, pursuant to the Maryland Annotated Code, Human Services Article, §8-703, to annually produce a State Resource Plan "in order to enhance access to services provided by RCCPs" and the Joint Chairmen's Report requesting an evaluation of "Maryland's family preservation programs in stemming the flow of children from their homes."

The Report for Fiscal Year 2012 (FY2012) is similar to the FY2011 Report and will be a consolidation of the two reports listed above. The Report reflects information as conveyed by the child-serving agencies including Department of Human Resources (DHR), Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH), Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) and the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE). The Report includes a separate discussion of the in-State and out-of-State placements in an effort to provide an in-depth review of both placement types.

In Maryland, children enter out-of-home care for a variety of reasons and under a number of different circumstances. Children may be placed in the care and custody of the State when they are determined to be a Child In Need of Assistance (CINA), a Child In Need of Supervision (CINS), or Delinquent. Children can also enter placement through a Voluntary Placement Agreement (VPA) in which a parent voluntarily places a child in the care of the State. This most often occurs when a child is unable to access funding for needed treatment through any avenue other than being in the care of the State. The State Child-Serving Agencies and Administrations responsible for placing children in out-of-home placements are DHR through the Local Departments of Social Services (LDSS); DJS; and DHMH, including the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration (ADAA), Developmental Disabilities Administration (DDA), and the Mental Hygiene Administration (MHA). Although MSDE funds out-of-home placements made by the Local School Systems (LSS), MSDE is not a placing agency and does not place children out-of-home. It should be noted that children whose placements are funded by MSDE, either in whole or in part, will be discussed in this Report as well as children placed by other Agencies and Administrations. These Agencies and Administrations may fund the placements or the placements may be funded by Medical Assistance (MA), which is administered through DHMH. Placements may also be co-funded by several State Agencies.

Each of these child-placing and funding Agencies and Administrations operates differently at the local level. DHMH (ADAA and MHA), DHR, and MSDE serve children and families through their 24 local counterparts within each of the jurisdictions - the LDSS, the local Core Service

Agencies (CSAs)¹, the local Substance Abuse Councils, and the LSS. DJS and DDA have regional offices, which, in turn, have local offices. For administrative purposes, DJS has six designated regions and DDA has four.

These regions are:

DJS

- Baltimore City
- Central Region (Baltimore, Carroll, Harford, and Howard Counties)
- Metro Region (Montgomery and Prince George's Counties)
- Eastern Shore Region (Caroline, Cecil, Dorchester, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico, and Worcester Counties)
- Southern Region (Anne Arundel, Calvert, Charles, and St. Mary's Counties)
- Western Region (Allegany, Frederick, Garrett, and Washington Counties)

DDA

- Central Region (Anne Arundel County, Baltimore City, and Baltimore, Harford and Howard Counties)
- Eastern Shore Region (Caroline, Cecil, Dorchester, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico, and Worcester Counties)
- Southern Region (Calvert, Charles, St. Mary's, Montgomery, and Prince George's Counties)
- Western Region (Allegany, Carroll, Frederick, Garrett, and Washington Counties)

Data Collection Methodology & Considerations

An Out-of-Home Placement Interagency Workgroup (Workgroup) was convened by the Children's Cabinet to review the FY2011 data collection methodology including reporting guidelines and submission requirements. Representatives of each child-serving Agency met throughout FY2012 and participated in the planning and development of the current report.

This is the third year that the Governor's Office for Children (GOC), on behalf of the Children's Cabinet, did not request detailed raw data from each Agency. Instead, GOC requested that Agencies provide aggregate data and corresponding narrative. This is one component of a concerted effort to ensure that the data presented in the Report accurately reflects the data each Agency uses in other agency-generated reports. GOC acknowledges that there will be incidences of duplicative placement information, so will ensure that the Report contains appropriate disclaimers.

The Report uses aggregate data submitted by each Agency for the fiscal years and one-day placements for each fiscal year. Accuracy of data reporting is dependent on a clearly-stated data

¹ One Core Service Agency located on the Eastern Shore serves five jurisdictions.

request. As in previous years, the Workgroup met initially with the Agencies to discuss reporting needs. Each Agency was given a data request guide along with data collection templates for data reporting and clarification of the information request. GOC also met individually with each Agency to ensure a thorough understanding of reporting requirements and recognition of the Agency's unique placement process and data collection methods.

Each child-serving Agency was requested to provide aggregate data using specific templates for children in placement and associated cost for the last three fiscal years. The following information describes the parameters of the requested data.

Age Group

This Report considers placement for children through their 21st birthday (*i.e.*, to age 20.999) on the date of admission for new placements and July 1st of the fiscal year for carryover placements. There are two exceptions to this rule: placements that are funded by MSDE include children who are served through the academic year of their 21st birthday and ADAA placements end at the child's 18th birthday when they are transitioned to the adult system.

Race

Any child who is identified in case records as having more than one race is included in the "Bi-Racial/Multiple Race" category. Children who are Hispanic are included in the "Other" category if they did not identify as any race but identified as being Hispanic in ethnicity.

Reporting Period

The charts and graphs featured in this report are derived from two data sources – "full fiscal year" data and "one-day census." The difference between the two is important. This Report marks tables using fiscal year data with a blue background and graphs using the one-day census with a white, or blank, background.

These are the definitions for each data reporting period:

- "*Full Fiscal Year*" - All placements during the fiscal year including carryover placements from the prior fiscal year(s). The fiscal year periods are as follows:

Fiscal Year 2009 (FY2009): July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009

Fiscal Year 2010 (FY2010): July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010

Fiscal Year 2011 (FY2011): July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011

Fiscal Year 2012 (FY2012): July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012

- "*One-Day Census*" - The one-day count date used for each fiscal year is as follows:

FY2009: January 31, 2009

FY2010: January 31, 2010

FY2011: January 31, 2011

FY2012: January 31, 2012

Definitions

- “*Bed-day*” - A unit of measurement that refers to a single day in which one child is provided placement at any out-of-home placement.
- “*Children/Youth*” - The term “youth” is synonymous with the term “child” but is often preferred to describe older adolescents or individuals 18 or older, and is typically used by Agencies that primarily serve these populations. A child is anyone under age 18, but most Agencies will serve individuals until their 21st birthday.
- “*One-Day Census*” - Also sometimes referred to as “One-Day Count.” The measurement of total population on one day out of the year. January 31st is consistently chosen because it is about halfway through the fiscal year. This measurement is useful to gauge the total serving capacity of placements at any one time.
- “*Population Flow*” - The total number of placements at start of the fiscal year, new admissions within the fiscal year, discharges within the fiscal year, and placements at the end of the fiscal year.
- “*Rate of New Placement Settings*” - The rate of new admissions into a category of out-of-home placement per 1,000 children (aged 0 to 18) within a given population.

Data Limitations

The FY2012 Report utilizes a variety of measurements to capture placement dynamics among diverse services, Agencies, and jurisdictions. Among those measurements are cost per bed-day, one-day census, population flow, and rate of entry per jurisdiction. Although the usefulness of these measurements varies depending on the context, these measurements provide a uniform method based on substantive information for comparing diverse placements and Agencies. Where the data serves as only a partial representation of placement dynamics or a particular Agency does not calculate data as prescribed by the measurement, the authors of this Report have made an effort to supplement the data and charts with additional information.

As with most measures, there are some limitations of the measurements used in this Report, including the following:

Cost per Bed-day

Not all agencies calculate bed-days.

One-Day Census

The totals are derived from a count of all children in placement on one day of the year. This is not the total number of children served in placement during the course of the year. The number is meant to show how many children may be in placement at any given time. It is possible that the yearly trend of census totals could be the opposite of an increasing or decreasing trend of “total served,” depending on children’s average length of stay in placement.

Population Flow

The population flow reflects changes in placements throughout the year. A change is considered a discharge or enrollment of any child in a new placement category (like from Family Home setting to Community-Based placement), a new jurisdiction (like a transfer from Somerset to

Anne Arundel County), or a new placing agency (like DHR or DJS). Thus, the population flow counts *placements*, and not *children*, because a child can be placed in more than one category, jurisdiction, or Agency in one year. This causes duplication of data and the result is that the placement numbers coming from population flow will be higher than the number of children who are actually placed. Also, the “total served” encompasses children who may have been placed since the previous year, or before.

Rate of New Placement Settings per Jurisdiction

The rate of new placement settings per jurisdiction data shows a useful trend when many children are being placed within that jurisdiction. But for jurisdictions where few children are placed each year, the difference of one or two children being placed can exaggerate changes in the trend. As the rate of new placement settings comes from the number of new placements (or starts) during the fiscal year and this number counts placements and not children (see “Population Flow” above), the rate of new placement settings will overstate the rate of children who enter placement each fiscal year.

DJS Out-of-Home Placement Information

The data given include only youth who are placed in either in-State or out-of-State committed programs. All committed youth are adjudicated delinquent and committed to the custody of DJS by the juvenile court. A continuum of out-of-home placement options has been developed for these youth, ranging from placement in a foster care setting to placement in a secure confinement facility. The cost data reported under each section also reflects only youth in committed placements. “Non-committed” DJS youth, who are not adjudicated or placed by the juvenile court, are not represented in the placement totals and placement costs in this Report.

MHA Cost Data

MHA services that are billed through Medicaid can be processed up to one year following the provision of the service, which is the time when MHA receives notice of an expenditure. For this reason, costs that were incurred by MHA from the previous fiscal year are updated the following year. This means that current year costs will be slightly understated and prior fiscal year costs will be higher than reported in the previous year.

DHR Cost Data

Services that DHR bills through Medicaid for its placements are not reflected in the DHR cost charts and they primarily include Residential Treatment Center placements. Instead, these costs appear in the MHA section. Additionally, DHR costs are reported by main placement category, but not by placement subcategory.

Unknown and Unavailable Placements

An “Unknown” or “Not Available” placement category is used to describe children who have run away or who cannot be identified in another placement category because an Agency’s automated records have not been updated. Differences among the placement subcategories are further explained in each of the placement category descriptions.

Report Overview

The FY2012 Report includes a Statewide summary of all out-of-home placements, four-year trend analyses and resource development of out-of-home placements by the Children’s Cabinet placement categories for in-State and out-of-State placements, a description of placements at Maryland’s School for the Blind and School for the Deaf, and a discussion of Maryland’s Family Preservation Services.

It is the intent of the Children’s Cabinet that the Report will provide an accurate and precise analysis of the four macro-placement categories (described below). As the Children’s Cabinet continues to strengthen, develop, and adopt strategies to serve children in their homes and communities, a more comprehensive understanding of the needs of children who require out-of-home placement will evolve. While the Children’s Cabinet Agencies improve the tracking and monitoring of placements, and identifies meaningful ways to measure progress, both the State and local jurisdictions will benefit through the planning of effective services and utilizing funding in the most effective and efficient manner.

Placement Categories

There are four categories of placement for children in the State of Maryland. These categories are used to describe Maryland’s out-of-home placement continuum, beginning with the least restrictive, most family-like setting (Family Home Settings) and moving progressively towards the most highly structured and treatment-oriented settings (Hospitalizations).

Category:	Family Home:	Community-Based:	Non-Community-Based:	Hospitalization:
Subcategory:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoptive Care • Foster Care • Formal Relative (Kinship) Care • Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care • Treatment Foster Care • Living-Arrangement – Family Home 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent Living Programs • Residential Child Care Program • Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA) • Living Arrangement – Community-Based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program • Non-Secure/Non-RTC • Residential Educational Facilities • Residential Treatment Centers • Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM) • Living Arrangement – Non-Community Based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-Patient Private • Psychiatric Hospitalization

Table 1: Placement Categories

While there is a range of out-of-home placement types, only two Agencies, DHR and DJS, place children in each of the placement categories. The other agencies – MSDE and the administrations of DHMH (MHA, DDA, and ADAA) – each place children in only one category of placement (although MSDE only funds placements and does not directly place children). The table below (Table 2) illustrates where the overlaps occur among Agencies in subcategories of placement and the subcategories that are specific to a particular Agency.

This Report is divided into the four out-of-home placement categories (Family Home, Community-Based, Non-Community Based, Hospitalization) followed by Family Preservation Services to families in their own homes. The sections feature a report from each of the Agencies that utilize that type of placement and the number and demographics of children served and any gaps in services for children that might need to be addressed. Because DHR and DJS are the only Agencies that place children in more than one placement category, each of these Agencies has a section in this Report summarizing findings from their total placements.

		Family Home Placement						Community-Based Placement				Non-Community Based Placement						Hospitalization Placement		
	Placing Agency	Adoptive Care	Foster Care	Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care	Treatment Foster Care	Living Arrangement - Family Home	Independent Living Programs	Residential Child Care Program	Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	Living Arrangement - Community-Based	Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	Non-Secure/Non-RTC	Residential Educational Facilities	Residential Treatment Centers	Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	In-Patient Private	Psychiatric Hospitalization
	DHR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X					X		X	X	X
	DJS		X			X		X	X			X	X	X		X	X			X
	MSDE														X	X				
	MHA															X				
	DDA							X	X	X										
	ADAA																X			

Table 2: State Agency Placement Categories

Agencies that place children in only one category of placement (MSDE, ADAA, MHA, and DDA) do not report in the summary section for each Agency's total data because that data is captured in reporting for the one category. Accordingly, the sections written by those Agencies do not include information that is otherwise included in the Agency-wide summaries provided by DHRS and DJS. The subheadings below show how each Agency's placement category section is organized and note in parentheses the Agencies that include the subheading in their section, if it does not apply to all. In the Out-of-State Demographics and Placement Costs sections, if the number for either is zero then there will be a brief notation explaining this and no charts will be provided. Also, where the number of children placed out-of-State in any placement category is under 10 the demographic information is not presented to protect confidentiality.

Population Totals

The population total is an overview of the number of children placed by the Agency during the one-day census. A pie graph demonstrates the ratio of children placed by subcategory and the line graph illustrates how the number of placements have increased or decreased over the last three years.

Population Flow (MSDE, ADAA, MHA, DDA)

Unlike the one-day census data, the population flow data follows the total number of children who come into placement during a year, including the amount of placements at the beginning of the year; how many are enrolled, discharged, and remain in placement at the end of the year. The number of total placements is also the basis for the "Rate of New Placement Settings" – the rate of children who enter out-of-home placement per one thousand children within the given jurisdiction.

Population Demographics

Characteristics based on the age, gender, and race of children placed are analyzed using a three-year trend and the percent change between each year.

Out-of-State Demographics (DHR, DJS)

In addition to the total number of children placed in out-of-State care, this section provides the same kind of information as the population demographics, but pertaining only to out-of-State placements.

Placement Costs

Agencies report on the total costs and out-of-State costs for each subcategory, as well as the cost per "bed-day." The latter number demonstrates how costs have increased or decreased relative to each child/youth that is placed in care.

Section II: Statewide Summary & Highlights

Overview


Data reported and discussed in this section of the Report represent two sources: a one-day census in Maryland, conducted on January 31st of each fiscal year of all children in out-of-home placements made or funded by Maryland Agencies or Administrations, and data on demographics, cost, and rate of entry for each fiscal year.

Information on each child was gathered by the placing or funding Agency/Agencies and submitted to GOC for inclusion in this Report. The Report provides information on the number of placements in particular categories of out-of-home placements and analyzes them within the context of the children’s home jurisdiction, the jurisdiction in which they are placed, and the placement or funding Agency/Agencies.

This section provides a summary of the Statewide data and highlight key findings.

Out-of-Home Placement (OOHP) Summary Data: State of Maryland


Population Totals



Placements By Agency, 1/31/2012	
Agency	Placements
ADAA	180
DDA	95
DHR	7,014
DJS	957
MHA	371
MSDE	58

Chart 1


There are four agencies in the State of Maryland that place children, one of which includes the three administrations contained in DHMH: DDA, MHA, and ADAA. Of the four agencies, DHR places the majority of children in out-of-home placement. Eighty-one percent of children in out-of-home placement counted during the one-day census in 2012, a total of 7,014 children, had been referred by DHR. It must be noted that because some children are placed by more than one agency, there are actually fewer children in placement than the number of placements counted.



All Agencies All Categories Placement Trends						
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	2,035	1,718	1,514	1,465	-10.2%	-3.2%
Family Home Settings	6,755	6,490	5,840	5,359	-7.4%	-8.2%
Hospitalization	29	31	43	18	-4.2%	-58.1%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	1,704	1,686	1,646	1,531	-3.5%	-7.0%
Placement Category Not Available	251	435	336	302	13.5%	-10.1%
All Categories	10,774	10,360	9,379	8,675	-6.9%	-7.5%

Chart 2

Since 2009, the number of children counted during the one-day census has decreased in every placement category, with the largest percent decrease being in Community-Based Residential placements with a 10.2% average annual decrease. This is consistent with the long-term goal to utilize Family Home Settings and intensive services for children whose needs might otherwise necessitate placement in a Community-Based Residential facility. In 2012, however, the number of children counted during the one-day census decreased more in Family Home Settings than any other placement category (except Hospitalization, because its low number of annual placements is subject to greater fluctuations in percent change). Overall, the number of children in placement during the one-day census has steadily decreased by 6.9% annually since 2009.



All Agencies All Categories % Placement Trends				
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012
Community-Based Residential Placement	18.9%	16.6%	16.1%	16.9%
Family Home Settings	62.7%	62.6%	62.3%	61.8%
Hospitalization	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	15.8%	16.3%	17.5%	17.6%
Placement Category Not Available	2.3%	4.2%	3.6%	3.5%
All Categories	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chart 3


Chart 3 shows how the proportion of placements has been utilized over time out of the total number of out-of-home placements. Although Chart 2 illustrates that the number of children in placement have been decreasing since 2009, the proportion of Non-Community Based placements has gradually increased from 15.8% of children in placement during the one-day census in 2009 to 17.6% of placements in 2012. The increasing reliance on Non-Community Based placements might be partly attributable to the recent utilization of placement settings like Residential Treatment Centers (RTCs), Diagnostic Evaluation and Treatment Programs (DETPs), or Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM) for children with more intensive needs who are court-involved or considered delinquent. Family Home Settings support the highest number of placements for children at 62% of the total number of out-of-home placements counted during the one-day census.

Population Flow

All Agencies Placement Population Flow - All Placements (count of placements, not children)					
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Total Served	Ends in FY (Placement Exits)	Placements at End of FY
2010	10,499	17,636	28,135	17,972	10,163
2011	9,635	16,631	26,266	16,871	9,395
2012	9,060	16,524	25,584	17,170	8,414
Two-Year Change	-13.7%	-6.3%	-9.1%	-4.5%	-17.2%
Average Yearly Change	-7.1%	-3.2%	-4.6%	-2.2%	-9.0%
Recent Year Change	-6.0%	-0.6%	-2.6%	1.8%	-10.4%

Chart 4


Since at least FY2010, there has been a higher proportion of placement exits than new placements during each fiscal year, which explains why the total number of placements served has steadily decreased over this time period, by a rate of 4.6% annually. The number of placements counted during the one-day census is typically an amount within the number of placements at the start and at the end of each fiscal year where, for example, in FY2012 the number of children in placement decreased from 8,675 on 1/31/2012 to 8,414 at the end of the fiscal year.



All Agencies Total Served						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Family Home	15,306	15,720	14,772	14,351	-2.1%	-2.8%
Community-Based	5,370	4,544	4,161	3,935	-9.7%	-5.4%
Non-Community Based	6,637	6,992	6,154	6,115	-2.4%	-0.6%
Hospitalization	326	307	292	306	-2.0%	4.8%
Not Available	1,057	572	887	877	2.7%	-1.1%
Total	28,696	28,135	26,266	25,584	-3.7%	-2.6%

Chart 5

As the “Total Served” chart shows (Chart 5) in comparison with Chart 2, when capacity (or the one-day census) decreases at a higher rate than the percent change in total served, or the number of new placements opened in addition to current cases, this means that although the number of new placements is decreasing, the ratio of new placements to capacity is increasing. This trend points to a shorter average length of stay, which has been a goal for out-of-home placements because the longer a child is in placement, he or she tends to experience less stability and connection with family members. Unfortunately, a shortened length of stay does not always mean that children are going home earlier than before, because discharges from placement do not only mean that a child might have been reunified or adopted, but also that he or she could be admitted into another placement program. More information is needed to understand the dynamics of length of stay in out-of-home placement with overall child outcomes like discharge status.



All Agencies Total % Served				
	2009	2010	2011	2012
Family Home	53.3%	55.9%	56.2%	56.1%
Community-Based	18.7%	16.2%	15.8%	15.4%
Non-Community Based	23.1%	24.9%	23.4%	23.9%
Hospitalization	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.2%
Not Available	3.7%	2.0%	3.4%	3.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chart 6

There are interesting differences between Chart 6 and Chart 3, shown above. Given that the “Total Served” counts all children who are in placement at the start of the fiscal year and any new placements that are entered throughout the year, it is not surprising that the proportion of total served is different than the proportion of placements counted during the one-day census. For instance, the percentage of Non-Community Based placements served during each fiscal year since FY2009 is around 24%, which is roughly 6% higher than the percentage of children in placement during the one-day census for Non-Community Based placements. Family Home Settings, in contrast, are roughly 56% of all placements served, about 6% lower than the one-day census percentage. The reason for the difference is because a higher percentage of Non-Community Based placements are entered during the year in relation to the number of children who are in placement at any given time. Another way of describing this is that the average length of stay for a child in a Non-Community Based placement is shorter than the average length of stay for a child placed in a Family Home Setting – so with more children coming in and going out of placement during the year, there is a higher percentage of total cases served.


All Agencies Rate of New Placement Settings by Jurisdiction						
Jurisdiction	2010	2011	2012	Two Year Change	Average Change	One Year Change
Allegany	13.9	14.3	17.6	26%	13%	23%
Anne Arundel	5.5	4.8	6.1	11%	5%	27%
Baltimore	10.3	9.1	9.2	-11%	-5%	1%
Baltimore City	44.7	42.7	50.7	13%	7%	19%
Calvert	9.0	9.5	8.5	-6%	-3%	-11%
Caroline	12.7	14.0	13.1	3%	1%	-7%
Carroll	5.3	6.2	7.6	43%	21%	23%
Cecil	13.0	13.2	15.3	18%	9%	16%
Charles	8.1	7.6	7.8	-4%	-2%	4%
Dorchester	19.5	12.1	11.9	-39%	-20%	-2%
Frederick	8.4	6.9	8.1	-4%	-2%	17%
Garrett	22.0	15.1	24.8	13%	6%	64%
Harford	8.1	8.1	9.8	22%	11%	20%
Howard	2.9	2.9	2.9	-2%	-1%	1%
Kent	11.3	9.5	7.7	-32%	-16%	-19%
Montgomery	5.6	5.1	4.9	-12%	-6%	-2%
Prince George's	5.9	5.7	6.9	17%	9%	22%
Queen Anne's	8.5	6.6	7.6	-11%	-5%	15%
Somerset	17.1	14.7	24.3	42%	21%	65%
St. Mary's	8.2	11.5	10.2	25%	13%	-11%
Talbot	9.8	11.3	13.7	39%	20%	21%
Washington	13.1	13.6	15.1	16%	8%	11%
Wicomico	10.6	10.6	11.8	12%	6%	11%
Worcester	14.8	12.3	10.4	-29%	-15%	-15%
Total	11.6	11.0	12.3	6%	3%	12%

Chart 7²

The rate of new placement settings shows how many children in each jurisdiction are admitted into an out-of-home placement per 1,000 children in their jurisdiction. In FY2012, there were about 12 new out-of-home placements admitted out of every 1,000 children in the State of Maryland. This is the rate of entry into out-of-home placements during the fiscal year, so some of the children counted as new placements might have been counted more than once if they entered placement and were admitted into another placement type before the end of the year. This means that the rate of children entering out-of-home placement is actually lower than how it appears in this figure.

Demographics


² The values for 2012 are estimates from July 1, 2011, provided by the U.S. Census Bureau: <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/24/24510.html>. Further details on the methodology for these estimates are available at: http://www.census.gov/popest/methodology/intercensal_nat_meth.pdf.



All Agencies All Categories Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	2,122	1,953	1,647	1,616	-8.5%	-1.9%
6 through 11	1,842	1,562	1,306	1,116	-15.4%	-14.5%
12 through 17	4,703	4,481	3,972	3,639	-8.2%	-8.4%
18 and over	2,107	2,364	2,454	2,304	3.3%	-6.1%
Total	10,774	10,360	9,379	8,675	-6.9%	-7.5%

Chart 8


Children aged 12 to 17 represent the highest number of children served in out-of-home placements. In nearly every area the number of children per age category has been decreasing on average since 2009, generally due to efforts to prevent out-of-home placement. The only age category that has an average increase in placements is the 18 and over category, by 3.3% annually. The reason for this is that children placed by certain Agencies (DHR, MSDE, DDA, MHA, and some DJS placements) may remain in placement until their 21st birthday if they are enrolled in an educational or vocational program. The increase in the number of young adults aged 18 and over, then, represents the results of initiatives like Ready By 21™ to ensure that children in out-of-home placements have the resources and skills they need to transition successfully into adulthood.



All Agencies All Categories Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	6,085	5,766	5,285	4,815	-7.5%	-8.9%
Female	4,689	4,593	4,093	3,859	-6.2%	-5.7%
Unknown	0	1	1	1	NA	0.0%
Total	10,774	10,360	9,379	8,675	-6.9%	-7.5%

Chart 9

Fifty-six percent of the children in placement are males, according to the 2012 one-day census. The ratio of male to female children in placement has remained nearly the same over time.



All Agencies All Categories Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	13	10	7	6	-22.5%	-14.3%
Asian	33	33	33	30	-3.0%	-9.1%
Black or African-American	7,482	7,131	6,289	5,643	-8.9%	-10.3%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	3	5	5	5	22.2%	0.0%
White	2,602	2,489	2,383	2,388	-2.8%	0.2%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	302	309	279	267	-3.9%	-4.3%
Other	223	252	238	227	0.9%	-4.6%
Unknown	116	131	145	109	-0.4%	-24.8%
Total	10,774	10,360	9,379	8,675	-6.9%	-7.5%

Chart 10

Although the number of children in placement who are Black or African-American has decreased more significantly than any other race group, the number has decreased nearly in proportion with the overall decrease in out-of-home placements. During the one-day census of 2012, about 65% of children in placement were Black or African-American, down from about 69% in 2009. Children who are White were almost 28% of the children counted during the one-day census, which increased from about 24% in 2009.

Placement by Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																									
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	123	1.4%	81	0	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	10	3
Anne Arundel	289	3.3%	8	119	43	26	1	2	8	2	6	3	12	11	2	1	1	11	6	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	17	3
Baltimore	825	9.5%	13	22	354	262	0	1	15	9	1	7	7	12	28	13	2	7	13	0	1	1	0	12	1	0	23	21
Baltimore City	3933	45.3%	20	82	938	2165	1	4	29	12	9	16	24	22	58	50	0	28	121	0	8	3	0	17	5	0	124	197
Calvert	102	1.2%	3	1	6	4	47	1	3	0	5	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	5	0	4	0	0	1	4
Caroline	47	0.5%	0	2	6	1	0	24	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	4	0
Carroll	84	1.0%	12	1	15	1	0	0	35	0	0	0	6	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	1	0	
Cecil	165	1.9%	4	3	21	19	0	1	0	94	0	4	2	1	4	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3
Charles	130	1.5%	6	1	8	8	2	1	0	0	63	2	5	1	0	0	2	15	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	7	6
Dorchester	37	0.4%	2	2	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	15	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	1	1
Frederick	229	2.6%	13	4	12	8	0	2	2	2	0	0	120	0	1	2	0	20	4	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	4	9
Garrett	57	0.7%	9	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	3	4
Harford	291	3.4%	7	4	52	31	0	6	2	18	1	6	2	1	135	0	1	1	1	1	0	3	0	4	1	0	4	10
Howard	104	1.2%	4	1	23	29	0	0	1	2	1	0	3	1	1	27	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	2	0
Kent	14	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	674	7.8%	22	19	65	22	0	6	5	4	3	5	26	4	2	5	1	383	42	0	1	0	0	25	2	0	18	14
Prince George's	798	9.2%	14	33	66	42	8	3	12	2	16	7	21	18	2	15	2	43	408	0	2	1	0	28	1	0	36	18
Queen Anne's	28	0.3%	4	1	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0
Somerset	54	0.6%	0	0	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	0	1	1	19	2	1	1
St. Mary's	180	2.1%	0	4	9	14	12	0	0	0	20	0	5	4	2	1	3	6	26	0	0	64	0	0	0	0	9	1
Talbot	33	0.4%	1	0	4	2	0	2	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	7	0	3	4	0	1
Washington	269	3.1%	19	2	17	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	8	5	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	199	0	0	2	0
Wicomico	113	1.3%	4	6	14	10	0	1	1	0	0	11	2	9	2	0	5	1	0	0	1	0	10	4	24	0	8	0
Worcester	55	0.6%	1	2	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	14	12	3	1
OOS	41	0.5%	0	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	8675	100.0%	241	243	1105	2096	63	57	95	126	82	74	263	119	167	76	26	473	375	7	17	79	21	299	62	16	292	283
% of children from jurisdiction placed in			65.9%	41.2%	42.9%	55.0%	46.1%	51.1%	41.7%	57.0%	48.5%	40.5%	52.4%	47.4%	46.4%	26.0%	28.6%	56.8%	51.1%	17.9%	14.8%	35.6%	21.2%	74.0%	21.2%	21.8%	41.5%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed in			2.8%	2.8%	12.7%	24.2%	0.7%	0.7%	1.1%	1.5%	0.9%	0.9%	3.0%	1.4%	1.9%	0.9%	0.3%	5.5%	4.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.9%	0.2%	3.4%	0.7%	0.2%	3.4%	3.3%

Chart 11

Chart 11 shows the number of children from each jurisdiction who were in placement during the one-day census in 2012 and where they were placed in Maryland or out-of-State. The percent of children placed within their home jurisdiction ranges from 14.8% to 74% per jurisdiction. There are many reasons why a child might be placed out of his or her home jurisdiction. Keeping children within their home jurisdictions is preferred when making placement decisions because it allows for a better connection with family members and natural supports who have been involved with the children prior to placement. Sometimes, the home jurisdiction does not have the resources and services that the child needs. Certain types of higher intensity placements are only located in select areas around the State or might not have openings within the child's jurisdiction or in the State when the child is in need. It is also a priority to place children with relatives whenever possible (Kinship Care), and these homes might not be located in the home jurisdiction, but they are effective in helping to maintain family relationships. Three point four percent of children in Maryland are placed out-of-State.





Chart 12

There were 298 children in placement out-of-State during the one-day census of 2012, down 15% from 2011. The number of children in out-of-State placement has been decreasing by an average of 12.9% since 2009. The greatest decrease of children in out-of-State placement has been in the category of Family Home Settings. The number of children in Non-Community Based Residential placements, however, increased in the last year by 3.9%. Out-of-State placements in the Non-Community Based category are often utilized because the types of services offered in Non-Community Based placements can be specific to each particular child's needs and sometimes those placements are not available or have reached capacity when the child must be placed. According to the one-day census, children in Non-Community Based placements

make up over half of the children in out-of-State placements and 10.5% of the children placed in this category are placed out-of-State. This is a much higher percentage of out-of-State placement than any other category, as the next highest percentage of children placed out-of-State are in the Community-Based category, at 2.6% of all Community-Based placements.


Out-of-State Demographics



All Agencies Out-of-State All Categories Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	89	69	44	28	-31.7%	-36.4%
6 through 11	69	44	31	25	-28.4%	-19.4%
12 through 17	210	154	169	155	-8.4%	-8.3%
18 and over	120	113	98	90	-9.1%	-8.2%
Total	488	380	342	298	-15.0%	-12.9%

Chart 13


Nearly two-thirds of the children and young adults aged 12 and over in out-of-State placement during the one-day census were placed in Non-Community Based placements (100 children aged 12 to 17 and 62 young adults aged 18 and over). Almost all of the children aged 11 and under in out-of-State placement were placed in Family Home Settings, with all 28 of children aged birth to 5, and 22 of children aged 6 to 11. For younger children, the utilization of Family Home Settings is likely for Adoptive Care and Kinship placements where permanency resources or relatives who are best-suited for the children’s placement are located out-of-State. Older children typically are placed out-of-State due to the need for more intensive services, which is in line with a higher number of older children being placed in more restrictive settings like Community-Based or Non-Community Based placements.



All Agencies Out-of-State All Categories Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	323	253	246	221	-11.5%	-10.2%
Female	165	127	96	77	-22.4%	-19.8%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	488	380	342	298	-15.0%	-12.9%

Chart 14

Of the children in out-of-State placement, 74% of them are male; the percent of male children in out-of-State placement has increased over the past four years from 66.2% in 2009. This is roughly 20% higher than the ratio of males to females that are placed in-State and out-of-State in 2012, as seen in Chart 14 above.




All Agencies Out-of-State All Categories Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	1	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	4	2	3	0	-33.3%	-100.0%
Black or African-American	295	239	235	216	-9.6%	-8.1%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	169	121	87	69	-25.7%	-20.7%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	9	7	9	6	-9.0%	-33.3%
Other	7	6	6	6	-4.8%	0.0%
Unknown	4	4	2	1	-33.3%	-50.0%
Total	488	380	342	298	-15.0%	-12.9%

Chart 15

Seventy-two percent of children placed out-of-State during the one-day census of 2012 were Black or African-American, which is a disproportionately higher percent of Black or African-American children placed out-of-State based on their representation in the total number of out-of-home placements (65% of all out-of-home placements, as seen above). The major reason for this difference between Black or African-American children's representation in out-of-State placements versus their representation in all out-of-home placements is that a much higher percentage the children in out-of-State Non-Community Based placements, 82%, are Black or African-American and Non-Community Based placements are the majority of out-of-State placements.


Placement Costs



Placement Cost By Agency, 1/31/2012	
Agency	Cost
ADAA	\$4,662,413
DDA	\$5,908,302
DHR	\$215,361,539
DJS	\$85,863,850
MHA	\$66,545,026
MSDE	\$11,690,683

Chart 16


The costs of placing children in out-of-home care are paid for by the Agency that places each child. Costs are incurred based on the number of nights that each child remains in placement and reflect the cost of services rendered to the child and family as part of his or her plan of care, as well as the administrative costs of operating the program. As shown in Chart 1 above, although DHR accounts for 81% of overall placements, only 55% of the total costs of out-of-home placements in Maryland are attributed to DHR due to the overwhelming number of DHR placements that are Family Home Settings. Agencies' share of placement costs reflect the number of children that each Agency places in out-of-home care and the varying costs of the types of placements where each Agency places children in its custody.



All Agencies All Categories Total Cost Trends						
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$189,084,441	\$149,949,735	\$127,964,380	\$117,187,890	-14.6%	-8.4%
Family Home Settings	\$150,503,515	\$153,746,388	\$136,174,495	\$130,233,996	-4.5%	-4.4%
Hospitalization	\$196,350	\$266,698	\$270,091	\$236,563	8.2%	-12.4%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	\$157,438,085	\$150,212,835	\$132,542,239	\$142,373,364	-3.0%	7.4%
All Categories	\$497,222,391	\$454,175,656	\$396,951,205	\$390,031,813	-7.7%	-1.7%

Chart 17


The total cost of placement for Family Home Settings, Community-Based, and Non-Community Based Residential Placements are fairly proportionate with each sharing nearly a third of the total cost of out-of-home placement in Maryland in FY2012 (33.4%, 30%, and 36.5%, respectively). By contrast, Family Home Settings account for roughly 60% of the total number of children in out-of-home placement (as shown above in chart 2) with Community-Based and Non-Community Based Residential Placements making up 16.9 and 17.6% of total placements, respectively.



All Agencies Out of State All Categories Total Cost Trends						
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$7,537,178	\$5,792,677	\$10,573,213	\$6,481,015	6.9%	-38.7%
Family Home Settings	\$142,750	\$117,590	\$87,060	\$65,818	-22.7%	-24.4%
Hospitalization	\$196,350	\$266,698	\$270,091	\$0	-21.0%	-100.0%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	\$16,954,251	\$12,478,363	\$12,589,653	\$18,825,648	8.0%	49.5%
All Categories	\$24,830,529	\$18,655,328	\$23,520,017	\$25,372,481	3.0%	7.9%

Chart 18


Nearly 75% of out-of-State placement costs are for Non-Community Based Residential placements and the other 25% are for Community-Based Residential placements for FY2012. Out-of-State placements make up 5.5% of the total Community-Based placement costs in FY2012 and 13.2% of the total Non-Community Based placement costs. These two placement categories are the most highly utilized for out-of-State placements.



All Agencies All Categories Cost Per Bed-Day Trends						
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$256	\$231	\$217	\$226	-3.9%	4.1%
Family Home Settings	\$88	\$93	\$89	\$94	2.3%	5.6%
Hospitalization	\$721	\$730	\$739	\$550	-7.7%	-25.6%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	\$335	\$357	\$350	\$335	0.1%	-4.3%
All Categories	\$168	\$164	\$156	\$165	-0.5%	5.8%

Chart 19

The cost per bed-day illustrates the average cost of each child in placement depending on the placement category. Hospitalization is the most expensive placement per bed-day, even though it is the least expensive of the Statewide placement costs because it is so infrequently utilized. With an average Statewide cost of \$165 per bed-day for out-of-home placements, Hospitalization is over three times the cost of the average bed-day. Family Home placements are the least expensive because they require the least intensive services, overall. Costs per bed-day have slightly decreased on average by half a percent, although since FY 2009 there have been more significant average annual cost decreases of about 4% and 8% for Community-Based and Non-Community Based Residential placements.



All Agencies Out-of-State All Categories Cost Per Bed-Day Trends						
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$190	\$156	\$238	\$380	31.4%	59.7%
Family Home Settings	\$2	\$2	\$2	\$2	0.0%	0.0%
Hospitalization	\$721	\$730	\$739	\$0	-32.5%	-100.0%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	\$318	\$332	\$334	\$298	-1.9%	-10.8%
All Categories	\$125	\$110	\$170	\$221	24.2%	30.0%


Chart 20

On average, out-of-State placements are more expensive per bed-day, because a lesser percentage of the placements are in Family Home Settings, which due to their low cost bring down the average cost of overall placements. Out-of-State Non-Community Based placements are less than in-State Non-Community Based placements, at 89% of the total cost of that placement category. Out-of-State Community-Based placements, on the other hand, are much higher than in-State Community-Based placements, at 168% of the total Community-Based cost. Based solely on the in-State cost per bed-day of Community-Based placements versus out-of-State costs, if the out-of-State Community-Based placements could be moved in-State it would generate a savings of more than \$3.7 million.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR) OVERVIEW

DHR prioritizes child safety, permanency, and well-being in providing care and services for children and families. DHR is committed to ensuring that children and youth in out-of-home care are placed in Family Home Settings whenever safe and possible. This is one of the central principles of the Place Matters Initiative, which began in July 2007. DHR’s Family-Centered Practice initiative ensures family and child participation in case planning and decision-making. Since the beginning of Place Matters, the percentage of children/youth in Family Home Settings has increased to 76% of the current DHR out-of-home population.

Population Totals



DHR Placements by Category, 1/31/2012	
Category	Placements
Community-Based Residential Placement	1,116
Family Home Settings	5,286
Hospitalization	11
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	299
Placement Category Not Available	302

Chart 21

Family homes (for DHR) are defined as placements in a family setting, and include:

- Relative/kinship care (paid/restricted/relative and unpaid/formal kinship care);
- Living arrangements (primarily Trial Home Visits with family of origin, but also including own home/apartment);
- Adoptive care (pre-finalized adoptive homes);
- Foster care (emergency, intermediate, regular foster care, and respite care); and
- Treatment foster care (private and public).

Relative/Kinship Care is divided into two categories – paid and unpaid – although the type of placement and experience for the child is not significantly different because both represent placement with the child’s relative, which is always preferable when safe and possible. In both types of placements, children are in the care/custody of the local Department of Social Services (LDSS). Together, these placement categories represent 32% of all DHR Family Home placements, and 24% of all DHR out-of-home placements.

DHR utilizes “Living Arrangement” as a data-entry category that contains several different types of placements. In the Family Home category, there are two main types of Living Arrangement placements: trial home-visits and own home/apartment. The trial home-visit category includes placements with the child’s parents/family of origin, and represents what others may consider “aftercare” – the time period in which the child is living with his/her parents/family of origin, after a period of out-of-home placement, but the child remains under the care/custody of the LDSS. This type of placement is used when the parents/caregivers have demonstrated reduced risk and increased safety, and are preparing for reunification. Older youth may also live in their own home/apartments, either while working or attending college or other job training programs. Together, these categories represent 6% of all Family Home placements, and 4% of all DHR out-of-home placements.

Approximately 10% of all children/youth in DHR out-of-home care have a plan of adoption as their permanency plan, and approximately 5% are legally free for adoption, meaning their parents’ parental rights have been terminated.³ Not all children/youth who are legally free for adoption have a plan of adoption and not all children with a plan of adoption are legally free for adoption. Older, legally free youth may be working towards Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA). Slightly less than 1% of all children placed in Family Homes, and less than 1% of all children/youth in DHR out-of-home care, are in pre-adoptive placements, which represent a “forever-family” for these children.


Together, these placement types – Relative/Kinship Care, Living Arrangement/Family Home (trial home visit or own home/apartment), and Pre-Adoptive Home – represent 29% of all children in DHR out-of-home care. These children are in the least restrictive of all DHR out-of-home placement types, living with their family of origin (in preparation for reunification), relatives, or pre-adoptive families. While in these placements, children remain in the care/custody of the LDSS and continue to receive services to ensure safety, stability of placement, and well-being.

Foster care and Treatment Foster Care represent 61% of all Family Home placements, and 46% of all DHR out-of-home placements. These placements represent the least-restrictive placements available to children outside of their own family or adoptive family.

The proportion of DHR’s Community-Based placements decreased substantially in 2010, and has remained stable at approximately 15.6% since then. Residential child care program placements constitute 77% of all Community-Based DHR placements, and 12% of all DHR out-of-home placements. Independent Living program placements represent 18% of all Community-Based DHR placements, and 3% of all DHR out-of-home placements. There is a small number of other Community-Based placements, including youth in college, Job Corps, and other placements.


³ “DHR/SSA Monthly Child Welfare Data - Jan2012”: http://www.dhr.state.md.us/blog/?page_id=2856

Approximately 4% of all children in DHR care/custody are placed in Non-Community Based placements. These placements include Residential Treatment Centers (RTCs), juvenile detention/treatment facilities, or adult criminal correctional institutions. RTCs comprise a majority of these placements (65%). Less than 1% of all DHR children are hospitalized. Both of these placement categories are driven by severe mental health and medical needs, and the juvenile/adult criminal justice system, although past abuse and trauma may contribute to individual children’s issues.



DHR All Categories Placement Trends						
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	1,649	1,321	1,170	1,116	-12.0%	-4.6%
Family Home Settings	6,672	6,397	5,765	5,286	-7.4%	-8.3%
Hospitalization	21	23	38	11	1.2%	-71.1%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	335	339	306	299	-3.6%	-2.3%
Placement Category Not Available	251	435	336	302	13.5%	-10.1%
All Categories	8,928	8,515	7,615	7,014	-7.7%	-7.9%

Chart 22



DHR All Categories Placement % Trends				
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012
Community-Based Residential Placement	18.5%	15.5%	15.4%	15.9%
Family Home Settings	74.7%	75.1%	75.7%	75.4%
Hospitalization	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	3.8%	4.0%	4.0%	4.3%
Placement Category Not Available	2.8%	5.1%	4.4%	4.3%
All Categories	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%


Chart 23

Population Flow

DHR Placement Population Flow - All Placements (count of placements, not children)					
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Total Served	Ends in FY (Placement Exits)	Placements at End of FY
2010	8,685	12,057	20,742	12,789	7,953
2011	7,953	11,817	19,770	12,261	7,509
2012	7,341	11,775	19,116	12,396	6,720
Two-Year Change	-15.5%	-2.3%	-7.8%	-3.1%	-15.5%
Average Yearly Change	-7.7%	-1.2%	-3.9%	-1.5%	-7.8%
Recent Year Change	-7.7%	-0.4%	-3.3%	1.1%	-10.5%

Chart 24

The total DHR out-of-home population has been decreasing over the past several years, due to decreases in entries. Although there have also been decreases in exits, each year's total number of exits has still exceeded entries, resulting in a reduction in the out-of-home population. The yearly end of year count has decreased an average of nearly 8% each of the past three fiscal years.




DHR Total Served						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Family Home	15,095	15,510	14,564	14,178	-2.0%	-2.7%
Community-Based	4,276	3,592	3,317	3,074	-10.3%	-7.3%
Non-Community Based	732	831	794	755	1.4%	-4.9%
Hospitalization	253	237	208	232	-2.3%	11.5%
Not Available	1,057	572	887	877	2.7%	-1.1%
Total	21,413	20,742	19,770	19,116	-3.7%	-3.3%

Chart 25

DHR Placement Population Flow - By Category							
	FY	Community-Based	Family Home Settings	Hospitalization	Non-Community Based	Not Available	All Categories
Placements at beginning of FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2010	1,422	6,673	35	353	202	8,685
	2011	1,254	6,104	18	319	258	7,953
	2012	1,133	5,567	23	310	308	7,341
Percentage of Total Placements	2010	16.4%	76.8%	0.4%	4.1%	2.3%	100.0%
	2011	15.8%	76.8%	0.2%	4.0%	3.2%	100.0%
	2012	15.4%	75.8%	0.3%	4.2%	4.2%	100.0%
Entries during FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2010	2,170	8,837	202	478	370	12,057
	2011	2,063	8,460	190	475	629	11,817
	2012	1,941	8,611	209	445	569	11,775
Percentage of Total Placements	2010	18.0%	73.3%	1.7%	4.0%	3.1%	100.0%
	2011	17.5%	71.6%	1.6%	4.0%	5.3%	100.0%
	2012	16.5%	73.1%	1.8%	3.8%	4.8%	100.0%
Served during FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2010	3,592	15,510	237	831	572	20,742
	2011	3,317	14,564	208	794	887	19,770
	2012	3,074	14,178	232	755	877	19,116
Percentage of Total Placements	2010	17.3%	74.8%	1.1%	4.0%	2.8%	100.0%
	2011	16.8%	73.7%	1.1%	4.0%	4.5%	100.0%
	2012	16.1%	74.2%	1.2%	3.9%	4.6%	100.0%
Exits during FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2010	2,338	9,406	219	512	314	12,789
	2011	2,188	8,954	178	490	451	12,261
	2012	2,017	9,194	211	468	506	12,396
Percentage of Total Placements	2010	18.3%	73.5%	1.7%	4.0%	2.5%	100.0%
	2011	17.8%	73.0%	1.5%	4.0%	3.7%	100.0%
	2012	16.3%	74.2%	1.7%	3.8%	4.1%	100.0%
Placements at end of FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2010	1,254	6,104	18	319	258	7,953
	2011	1,129	5,610	30	304	436	7,509
	2012	1,057	4,984	21	287	371	6,720
Percentage of Total Placements	2010	15.8%	76.8%	0.2%	4.0%	3.2%	100.0%
	2011	15.0%	74.7%	0.4%	4.0%	5.8%	100.0%
	2012	15.7%	74.2%	0.3%	4.3%	5.5%	100.0%

Chart 26

Demographics



DHR All Categories Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	2,121	1,952	1,647	1,615	-8.5%	-1.9%
6 through 11	1,773	1,516	1,245	1,058	-15.8%	-15.0%
12 through 17	3,381	3,201	2,784	2,476	-9.8%	-11.1%
18 and over	1,653	1,846	1,939	1,865	4.3%	-3.8%
Total	8,928	8,515	7,615	7,014	-7.7%	-7.9%


Chart 27

The largest age group in DHR care remains children aged 12 to 17, constituting 35% of all children in DHR out-of-home care. Youth aged 18 and over represent 27% of all children/youth in DHR care, and the youngest age group – children under 5 – constitute 23%. The smallest age group is children aged 6 to 11, which represent 15% of all children in care.

There has been an average yearly decrease in the number of children in care in all age groups on except youth aged 18 and over. Each year between 2009 and 2011, this age group saw increasing numbers, although there was a decrease in 2012. The past increases were expected, as DHR's policies encourage youth who have not exited care to permanency to remain in care after age 18. The recent decrease will be monitored to determine if this is the beginning of a new trend, or a one-year discrepancy.

DHR policy and the Place Matters and Family Centered Practice initiatives prohibit placement of children younger than age 12 in group home placements, and establishes Family Home placements as the preferred setting, when safe and appropriate. In keeping with the policy and initiatives, 98% of all children in out-of-home care aged 5 and under are placed in Family Home Settings, as are 93% of children aged 6 to 11. Of children aged 12 to 17, 25% are placed in Family Homes, and 14% of youth aged 18 and over are in family homes.


Of children aged 12 to 17, 7% are placed in Community-Based placements, and 9% of youth aged 18 and over are also placed in Community-Based placements.



DHR All Categories Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	4,674	4,388	3,922	3,531	-8.9%	-10.0%
Female	4,254	4,127	3,692	3,482	-6.4%	-5.7%
Unknown	0	0	1	1	NA	0.0%
Total	8,928	8,515	7,615	7,014	-7.7%	-7.9%

Chart 28

The percentage of children/youth in DHR Family Homes by gender remains even. As shown above, there have been decreases in the overall numbers of males and females. The difference between males and females is less than 1% of children in DHR care, with a trend of slightly more males than females.



DHR All Categories Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	10	7	4	3	-32.6%	-25.0%
Asian	23	23	24	20	-4.1%	-16.7%
Black or African-American	6,461	6,085	5,270	4,705	-10.0%	-10.7%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	3	5	3	3	8.9%	0.0%
White	1,917	1,843	1,792	1,809	-1.9%	0.9%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	302	309	278	264	-4.3%	-5.0%
Other	118	137	139	136	5.1%	-2.2%
Unknown	94	106	105	74	-5.9%	-29.5%
Total	8,928	8,515	7,615	7,014	-7.7%	-7.9%

Chart 29

On average, and in the last year, the percentage of Black or African-American children/youth in out-of-home care has decreased. This has resulted in a DHR out-of-home population which, in 2012, was 67% Black or African-American and 26% White. The higher rate of decrease among Black or African-Americans than Whites has resulted in a smaller gap between the two racial groups in 2012 compared to 2009, when the proportions were 72% and 21%, respectively.


Placement by Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement % of children statewide in placements from Jurisdiction		Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																									
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	86	1.2%	65	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	9	3
Anne Arundel	160	2.3%	0	92	18	8	1	1	2	2	6	1	1	0	1	1	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	3
Baltimore	580	8.3%	1	20	304	135	0	0	9	8	0	2	2	0	28	13	0	3	13	0	1	1	0	8	1	0	10	21
Baltimore City	3630	51.8%	3	69	890	2094	1	2	14	12	9	4	10	3	58	50	0	12	120	0	8	3	0	10	3	0	58	197
Calvert	80	1.1%	0	0	3	2	46	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	1	4	
Caroline	35	0.5%	0	0	4	1	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	
Carroll	41	0.6%	0	1	5	1	0	0	27	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	129	1.8%	0	2	15	6	0	0	0	93	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3
Charles	101	1.4%	1	0	7	3	2	0	0	0	61	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	
Dorchester	18	0.3%	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	
Frederick	148	2.1%	1	2	8	3	0	2	2	1	0	0	80	0	1	2	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	2	9
Garrett	48	0.7%	4	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	3	4
Harford	253	3.6%	1	1	47	22	0	4	1	17	1	2	1	1	134	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	0	1	1	0	3	10
Howard	74	1.1%	1	1	22	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	21	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	
Kent	6	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	493	7.0%	2	15	51	10	0	0	3	2	3	1	13	0	2	5	0	303	40	0	1	0	0	20	2	0	6	14
Prince George's	586	8.4%	2	13	47	22	7	2	2	2	16	0	2	0	2	15	0	25	393	0	2	1	0	6	1	0	8	18
Queen Anne's	15	0.2%	0	1	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Somerset	47	0.7%	0	0	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	1	1	18	2	1	1	
St. Mary's	156	2.2%	0	3	7	8	10	0	0	0	20	0	1	0	2	1	2	5	26	0	0	62	0	0	0	0	8	1
Talbot	26	0.4%	0	0	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	6	0	2	4	0	1	
Washington	222	3.2%	3	0	13	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	186	0	0	2	0	
Wicomico	41	0.6%	0	2	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	19	0	5	0	
Worcester	39	0.6%	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	11	12	3	1	
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	7014	100.0%	84	223	1466	2347	67	41	61	138	121	38	123	37	236	109	10	366	632	7	27	76	8	277	65	18	140	293
% of children from jurisdiction			75.6%	57.5%	52.4%	57.7%	57.5%	60.0%	65.9%	72.1%	60.4%	44.4%	54.1%	56.3%	53.0%	28.4%	66.7%	61.5%	67.1%	33.3%	17.0%	39.7%	23.1%	83.8%	46.3%	30.8%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all			1.2%	3.2%	20.9%	33.5%	1.0%	0.6%	0.9%	2.0%	1.7%	0.5%	1.8%	0.5%	3.4%	1.6%	0.1%	5.2%	9.0%	0.1%	0.4%	1.1%	0.1%	3.9%	0.9%	0.3%	2.0%	4.2%

Chart 30

Two-thirds of all Maryland jurisdictions have a majority of DHR children placed within their home jurisdiction. Six of the Eastern Shore jurisdictions do not, including Dorchester, Queen Anne’s, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico, Worcester Counties, and also St. Mary’s County. The Eastern Shore continues to struggle to support Community- and Non-Community-Based placement resources, due to the low number of children in need of such placements. These jurisdictions also have difficulty recruiting foster parents for children with special needs, including older youth.

Additionally, Howard County has less than 30% of all children placed within-county; this may be due to the fact that Howard’s proximity to other jurisdictions within the State; Howard County borders six other counties, and therefore out-of-county placements may actually be closer to a child’s home than an in-county placement.



DHR All Categories OOS Trends						
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	67	48	45	39	-16.0%	-13.3%
Family Home Settings	237	187	141	97	-25.6%	-31.2%
Hospitalization	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	0	0	1	3	NA	200.0%
Placement Category Not Available	0	3	1	1	NA	0.0%
All Categories	304	238	188	140	-22.8%	-25.5%


Chart 31

For the past three years, less than 3% of all Family Home placements were out-of-State, with only 2% as of January 31, 2012. The number of these placements has continued to decrease in each of the past four years.

The number of children in out-of-State Family Home placements is dependent on individual children’s needs and family situations. Adoptive Care, Formal Kinship Care, trial home-visits, and own home/apartment constitute over 40% of all out-of-State placements in this category. These placements (Adoptive Care, Formal Kinship Care, trial home-visit, and own home/apartment) are completely child- and family-driven, as opposed to being driven by resource home availability. A child’s relatives or parents may be located in another state, the best


fit for an adoptive home may be out-of-State, and/or an older youth may choose to attend college out-of-State. Regardless of these locations, it is nearly always in the child’s best interest to be placed with biological family, with a permanent adoptive family, or to allow the youth to explore his or her educational and career potential.

Placement Costs:



DHR Cost Trends						
Cost Type	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Total Cost	\$301,566,171	\$264,644,544	\$225,439,051	\$215,361,539	-10.5%	-4.5%
Residential Cost	\$301,566,171	\$264,644,544	\$225,439,051	\$215,361,539	-10.5%	-4.5%
Educational Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Administrative Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
% Residential	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% Educational	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	NA	NA
% Administrative	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	NA	NA

Chart 32




DHR Out-of-State Cost Trends						
Cost Type	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Total Cost	\$4,811,102	\$2,590,105	\$6,254,090	\$6,546,833	33.3%	4.7%
Residential Cost	\$4,811,102	\$2,590,105	\$6,254,090	\$6,546,833	33.3%	4.7%
Educational Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Administrative Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
% Residential	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% Educational	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	NA	NA
% Administrative	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	NA	NA

Chart 33


As the number of children in care has decreased, DHR costs for out-of-home placements have decreased each of the past four years, with an average yearly decrease of nearly 11%. This past year’s decrease, however, was approximately 5%. Cost decreases are also driven by the increase in Family Home placements for children, as opposed to Community-Based placements: Family Home placements are generally less expensive than Community-Based placements, and some do not require funding (*i.e.*, trial home visit).

Out-of-State costs, however, have increased from FY2009 to FY2012 (Table 14), despite the overall reduction in the number of children in out-of-State placements. Over the past four years, an average of 98% of all DHR out-of-State costs are for Community-Based Placements, with the remaining 2% for family-home placements. Except for Family Home placements, out-of-State placements are generally more expensive than in-State placements, as children are only placed out-of-State when their needs cannot be met by in-State resources; typically, these children have intensive needs. Costs for out-of-State placements are based on three factors: the per-bed day cost of each placement; the proportion of high-intensity/expensive placements utilized; and the proportion of costs shared with other State Agencies. Increases in per-bed day costs, higher numbers of children needing more expensive/more intense placements, and the proportion of DHR versus other State Agency funding of each placement all contribute to varying and increasing out-of-State costs.



DHR All Categories Total Cost Trends						
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$156,230,898	\$115,833,311	\$93,862,100	\$89,645,537	-16.4%	-4.5%
Family Home Settings	\$145,335,273	\$148,811,233	\$131,576,951	\$125,716,002	-4.5%	-4.5%
All Categories	\$301,566,171	\$264,644,544	\$225,439,051	\$215,361,539	-10.5%	-4.5%


Chart 34



DHR Out of State All Categories Total Cost Trends						
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$4,668,352	\$2,472,515	\$6,167,030	\$6,481,015	35.8%	5.1%
Family Home Settings	\$142,750	\$117,590	\$87,060	\$65,818	-22.7%	-24.4%
All Categories	\$4,811,102	\$2,590,105	\$6,254,090	\$6,546,833	33.3%	4.7%

Chart 35

As more children and more bed-days fall into the Family Home category, the overall cost for this placement category is higher than the overall costs for Community-Based Residential placements. Community-Based Residential placements, however, typically have a higher per-bed day cost.



DHR All Categories Cost Per Bed-Day Trends						
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$281	\$250	\$229	\$233	-5.9%	1.7%
Family Home Settings	\$86	\$92	\$88	\$93	2.8%	5.7%
All Categories	\$135	\$127	\$118	\$124	-2.6%	5.1%

Chart 36

Chart 36 shows continued decreases in the cost per bed-days utilized by children in DHR out-of-home care. As expected, the most significant average annual decreases are seen in Community-Based Placements. The total cost per bed-day for all placements have decreased on average over each of the past four years.

Conclusion

Needs

Maryland continues to need resource parents for teens, sibling groups and medically fragile children. Though gains have been made in these areas, especially through educating current resource parents, they remain the most needed. Recruitment continues for minority resource parents and Spanish-speaking parents, in particular. In many cases, the potential resource parents who respond to outreach efforts are only interested in younger children or solely children whose permanency plans are adoption.

Summary

DHR has made significant reductions in the number of children in DHR out-of-home care since the initiation of the Place Matters Initiative in July 2007, and current Family Centered Practices and other strategies continue to support these efforts.

Approximately 75% of all children in DHR out-of-home care are placed in Family Homes, reflecting the success of the Place Matters Initiative in keeping children in Family Homes. The total number of children in Family Home placements has decreased along with the total out-of-home population. Twenty-nine percent of all children in DHR out-of-home care are placed with their family of origin (*e.g.*, for trial home visit), relatives, or in a pre-adoptive home.


The largest age group in DHR out of home placements is children aged 12 to 17 years old (35%), and 67% of all children in DHR out-of-home care are Black or African-American. The proportion of males and females are nearly equal.

Approximately 98% of all children under age six and 94% of all children aged 6 to 11 in DHR out-of-home care are in Family Home placements.

Placement needs are highest for children with special needs and older youth. DHR will continue to look for alternatives to congregate (group home) placements when appropriate for specific children, and will increase efforts to place children in public foster care homes in lieu of Treatment Foster Care (TFC) homes when possible. Statewide efforts to provide Community-Based and supportive services to children with intensive needs should be continued.

DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS) OVERVIEW


Population Totals



DJS Placements by category, 1/31/2012	
Category	Placements
Community-Based Residential Placement	254
Family Home Settings	73
Hospitalization	7
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	623
Placement Category Not Available	0


Chart 37

As of 1/31/2012, of the total 957 youth placed out of home, Non-Community-Based placements constitute approximately two-thirds or 65%. This category includes youth admitted to Residential Treatment Centers (RTCs), hardware and staff-secure programs. Most of DJS' hardware secure programs are contracted through out-of-State vendors with the exception of two State-operated programs: The Victor Cullen Center serving male youth and the Carter Young Women Center for female youth. In FY2012, committed young women from the Thomas J.S. Waxter Children's Center facility were transferred to Carter, and Waxter was closed for committed females, although the detention center programs remains in operation. The majority of youth in staff-secure programs are served at the State-operated Youth Centers and a few others by out-of-State private vendors. DJS places committed youth in RTC programs both in-State and out-of-State. Because DJS uses RTCs, the Hospitalization category includes only youth who are admitted for a mental health disorder emergency care. This is the least used category. Community-based residential placements are for less high risk offenders and these include group homes and therapeutic group homes. As of 1/31/2012, of the total 957 youth, one-fourth or 27% were being served in these programs. Family home settings include foster care and therapeutic foster care. Approximately 8% were in family settings.



DJS All Categories Placement Trends						
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	238	268	237	254	2.7%	7.2%
Family Home Settings	83	93	75	73	-3.3%	-2.7%
Hospitalization	8	8	5	7	0.8%	40.0%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	556	562	630	623	4.0%	-1.1%
Placement Category Not Available	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
All Categories	885	931	947	957	2.7%	1.1%

Chart 38



DJS All Categories Placement % Trends				
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012
Community-Based Residential Placement	26.9%	28.8%	25.0%	26.5%
Family Home Settings	9.4%	10.0%	7.9%	7.6%
Hospitalization	0.9%	0.9%	0.5%	0.7%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	62.8%	60.4%	66.5%	65.1%
Placement Category Not Available	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
All Categories	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chart 39

One-day census counts can show an overall year to year trend, but it is important not to over-interpret small apparent changes, which could reflect short-term fluctuations that do not necessarily bear out over the full year. The above data show some small apparent changes in the census numbers for each program type. The only significant, though modest, change is an increase in the number and percent of placements in Non-Community-Based Programs. The percentage grew from 62.8% in 2009 to 65.1% in 2012. The overall number of youth in such programs increased 4%, from 556 to 623. This reflects the increased capacity in these programs through the addition of the Victor Cullen and Silver Oak Academy programs. The increase in Non-Community-Based residential placement can also be associated with the development and use of the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment and Service Planning (MCASP) assessment tool put in place in FY2011 to place youth in more appropriate programs and make services available based on risk and need scores. The MCASP risk and needs assessment scores have allowed DJS workers to identify youth at high risk or above levels and process their cases to meet their service levels.


Population Flow

DJS Placement Population Flow - All Placements (count of placements, not children)					
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Total Served	Ends in FY (Placement Exits)	Placements at End of FY
2010	894	2,091	2,985	2,104	881
2011	881	1,986	2,867	1,894	973
2012	961	2,044	3,005	2,039	966
Two-Year Change	7.5%	-2.2%	0.7%	-3.1%	9.6%
Average Yearly Change	3.7%	-1.1%	0.3%	-1.5%	4.8%
Recent Year Change	9.1%	2.9%	4.8%	7.7%	-0.7%

Chart 40

The above chart shows the counts of placements of youth entering or exiting DJS out-of-home care. Within the same fiscal year, it is possible for a youth to have more than one placement admission or exit or both due to transfer or a new charge resulting in a new placement. A youth, however, is counted only in one placement at any point in time.

The start of FY average for three years has increased by 3.7%, while the end of FY average has increased by 4.8%. Each fiscal year “New Placements” have dropped by an average 1% while the “Placement Exits” average dropped by 1.5%. DJS had a slight increase in its youth served population; however, it is taking slightly longer for youth to exit the system resulting in end of year count being slightly higher. Youth generally stay in Non-Community (higher security) programs longer, so this increase in apparent lengths of stay comports with the increase in those types of placements.



DJS Total Served						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Family Home	210	210	208	173	-5.9%	-16.8%
Community-Based	902	783	692	688	-8.5%	-0.6%
Non-Community Based	1,915	1,922	1,883	2,070	2.8%	9.9%
Hospitalization	73	70	84	74	1.3%	-11.9%
Not Available	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	3,100	2,985	2,867	3,005	-0.9%	4.8%


Chart 41

DJS Placement Population Flow - By Category							
	FY	Community-Based	Family Home Settings	Hospitalization	Non-Community Based	Not Available	All Categories
Placements at beginning of FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2010	273	80	9	532	0	894
	2011	219	82	10	570	0	881
	2012	252	72	8	629	0	961
Percentage of Total Placements	2010	30.5%	8.9%	1.0%	59.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	2011	24.9%	9.3%	1.1%	64.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	2012	26.2%	7.5%	0.8%	65.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Entries during FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2010	510	130	61	1,390	0	2,091
	2011	473	126	74	1,313	0	1,986
	2012	436	101	66	1,441	0	2,044
Percentage of Total Placements	2010	24.4%	6.2%	2.9%	66.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	2011	23.8%	6.3%	3.7%	66.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	2012	21.3%	4.9%	3.2%	70.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Served during FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2010	783	210	70	1,922	0	2,985
	2011	692	208	84	1,883	0	2,867
	2012	688	173	74	2,070	0	3,005
Percentage of Total Placements	2010	26.2%	7.0%	2.3%	64.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	2011	24.1%	7.3%	2.9%	65.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	2012	22.9%	5.8%	2.5%	68.9%	0.0%	100.0%
Exits during FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2010	565	127	60	1,352	0	2,104
	2011	437	135	74	1,248	0	1,894
	2012	437	109	67	1,426	0	2,039
Percentage of Total Placements	2010	26.9%	6.0%	2.9%	64.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	2011	23.1%	7.1%	3.9%	65.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	2012	21.4%	5.3%	3.3%	69.9%	0.0%	100.0%
Placements at end of FY (Count of placements, not children)							
Numbers	2010	218	83	10	570	0	881
	2011	255	73	10	635	0	973
	2012	251	64	7	644	0	966
Percentage of Total Placements	2010	24.7%	9.4%	1.1%	64.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	2011	26.2%	7.5%	1.0%	65.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	2012	26.0%	6.6%	0.7%	66.7%	0.0%	100.0%

Chart 42


Over the past three years, DJS has reduced its Community-Based population from 31% at the start of FY2010 to 26% at the end of FY2012. Non-Community-Based placements, however, have increased from 60% at the start of FY2010 to 66% at the end of FY2012. This is due to the increase in total youth served in Non-Community-Based Placements from 64% in FY2010 to 69% in FY2012 compared to 26% of total youth served in Community-Based Placements in FY2010 to 23% in FY2012.

Demographics




DJS All Categories Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	1	1	1	NA	0.0%
12 through 17	687	705	686	724	1.8%	5.5%
18 and over	198	225	260	232	6.1%	-10.8%
Total	885	931	947	957	2.7%	1.1%

Chart 43



DJS All Categories Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	766	794	825	820	2.3%	-0.6%
Female	119	137	122	137	5.5%	12.3%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	885	931	947	957	2.7%	1.1%

Chart 44



DJS All Categories Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	2	2	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	3	2	3	0	-27.8%	-100.0%
Black or African-American	612	670	688	682	3.8%	-0.9%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	240	214	210	238	0.2%	13.3%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	25	36	40	36	15.0%	-10.0%
Unknown	3	7	6	1	11.9%	-83.3%
Total	885	931	947	957	2.7%	1.1%

Chart 45

The demographic makeup of DJS youth in out-of-home placements changed little in the annual one-day census counts shown in the charts above. Apparent increases in the proportion of female and African-American youth are not borne out in the full annual data that has been compiled for the DJS Data Resource Guide FY2012.


Unknown category includes youths whose race is not known or has not been recorded in the DJS ASSIST case record management system.

Placement by Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from Jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																									
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	22	2.3%	11	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	82	8.6%	6	8	14	9	0	0	6	0	0	1	8	11	1	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	7	0
Baltimore	77	8.0%	7	2	13	10	0	0	6	0	1	5	2	12	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	10	0
Baltimore City	208	21.7%	15	11	27	14	0	0	15	0	0	10	10	19	0	0	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	7	2	0	63	0
Calvert	14	1.5%	0	0	3	1	0	0	3	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	4	0.4%	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	28	2.9%	9	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	
Cecil	16	1.7%	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	19	2.0%	3	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	
Dorchester	6	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	
Frederick	25	2.6%	9	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Garrett	8	0.8%	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	17	1.8%	2	2	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	10	1.0%	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	76	7.9%	17	4	9	6	0	0	2	0	0	2	6	4	0	0	1	12	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	6	0
Prince George's	184	19.2%	12	18	17	14	0	0	10	0	0	7	18	18	0	0	2	16	7	0	0	0	22	0	0	23	0	0
Queen Anne's	8	0.8%	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Somerset	4	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	16	1.7%	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Talbot	4	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Washington	34	3.6%	15	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	57	6.0%	2	2	10	4	0	0	1	0	0	6	1	9	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	9	4	0	0	3	0
Worcester	14	1.5%	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0
OOS	24	2.5%	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	957	100.0%	118	53	126	84	2	0	48	0	2	43	69	89	3	0	17	65	14	0	0	0	15	66	11	0	132	0
% of children from jurisdiction			50.0%	9.8%	16.9%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	23.5%	0.0%	0.0%	54.2%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all			12.3%	5.5%	13.2%	8.8%	0.2%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.2%	4.5%	7.2%	9.3%	0.3%	0.0%	1.8%	6.8%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	6.9%	1.1%	0.0%	13.8%	0.0%	0.0%

Chart 46

One of the goals of DJS is to keep youth in-State as well as closer to home; however, the risk scores and treatment needs of each youth vary and it is important that the services fit the needs, with the availability of immediate placements considered. About 86% of DJS youths are placed into in-State programs. The rest (14%) are placed in out-of-State placements that provide specialized services for higher risk youths. These programs are specifically meant for fire setters (arson cases), sex offenders and serious substance abusers. DJS continuously makes efforts to place youth within the same region, but placement within the region is not practical for Baltimore City youth who account for 30% of the total out-of-home placements. The inability to place youth within the same region is due to the lack of available secure or hardware-committed programs in Baltimore City or the Central Maryland areas. Male youth have to be transported to either Youth Centers or Victor Cullen, both located in Western Maryland, and the high risk female youth are placed in the Carter Young Women Center in Kent County on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. DJS has plans for new State-operated secure treatment facilities in Maryland as part of its long-term capital plan.




DJS Out of State All Categories Placement Trends						
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	1	1	0	0	NA	NA
Family Home Settings	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Hospitalization	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	112	95	124	132	7.3%	6.5%
Placement Category Not Available	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
All Categories	113	96	124	132	6.9%	6.5%

Chart 47

Out-of-state placements have increased by an average of 7% from 1/31/09 to 1/31/12. It is important to keep in mind that one-day counts can distort the actual increase or decrease in percentages. According to full annual data for placement counts, youth placed out-of-State constitute about 14% of the total population compared to 13% in FY2011 and about the same in FY2009 followed by a decrease to 10% in FY2010.


Placement Costs



DJS Cost Trends						
Cost Type	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Total Cost	\$74,637,117	\$73,264,788	\$76,201,531	\$85,863,850	4.9%	12.7%
Residential Cost	\$59,447,722	\$58,313,237	\$59,293,997	\$66,425,534	3.9%	12.0%
Educational Cost	\$10,233,905	\$11,421,749	\$12,999,769	\$14,369,466	12.0%	10.5%
Administrative Cost	\$4,955,490	\$3,529,804	\$3,907,765	\$5,068,850	3.9%	29.7%
% Residential	79.6%	79.6%	77.8%	77.4%	-1.0%	-0.6%
% Educational	13.7%	15.6%	17.1%	16.7%	7.1%	-1.9%
% Administrative	6.6%	4.8%	5.1%	5.9%	-2.0%	15.1%


Chart 48

The greatest four-year change in residential costs was in educational costs. Educational Costs showed an average increase of 12% between FY2009 and FY2012. Non-Community-Based placements generally have on-site schools, whereas community- and family-based programs do not (youth attend local schools). This would account for the rise in educational costs, as Non-Community-Based placements increased over this period.




DJS Out of State Cost Trends						
Cost Type	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Total Cost	\$9,348,795	\$8,824,544	\$11,337,596	\$13,159,264	13.0%	16.1%
Residential Cost	\$7,820,698	\$7,470,200	\$9,792,637	\$11,165,414	13.5%	14.0%
Educational Cost	\$1,528,097	\$1,354,344	\$1,544,959	\$1,841,756	7.3%	19.2%
Administrative Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$152,093	NA	NA
% Residential	83.7%	84.7%	86.4%	84.8%	0.5%	-1.8%
% Educational	16.3%	15.3%	13.6%	14.0%	-4.9%	2.7%
% Administrative	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	NA	NA

Chart 49



DJS All Categories Total Cost Trends						
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$26,855,023	\$28,877,788	\$29,526,807	\$21,634,051	-5.7%	-26.7%
Family Home Settings	\$5,168,242	\$4,935,155	\$4,597,544	\$4,517,994	-4.4%	-1.7%
Hospitalization	\$196,350	\$266,698	\$270,091	\$236,563	8.2%	-12.4%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	\$42,417,502	\$39,185,147	\$41,807,089	\$59,475,242	13.8%	42.3%
All Categories	\$74,637,117	\$73,264,788	\$76,201,531	\$85,863,850	4.9%	12.7%


Chart 50



DJS Out of State All Categories Total Cost Trends						
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$2,863,321	\$3,320,162	\$4,406,183	\$0	-17.1%	-100.0%
Family Home Settings	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Hospitalization	\$196,350	\$266,698	\$270,091	\$0	-21.0%	-100.0%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	\$6,289,124	\$5,237,684	\$6,661,322	\$13,159,264	36.0%	97.5%
All Categories	\$9,348,795	\$8,824,544	\$11,337,596	\$13,159,264	13.0%	16.1%


Chart 51

A note on DJS expenditure data: Program billing data often comes from payments to programs that operate units across more than one category of service. Thus, an invoice may, for example, cover a payment for bed days of youth in Treatment Foster Care, Group Home, and Independent Living programs. It is not possible at this time to disaggregate the cost information accurately between program units, so expenditures at the individual program type level will not show accurate or meaningful trends.



DJS All Categories Cost Per Bed-Day Trends						
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$218	\$218	\$219	\$233	2.3%	6.4%
Family Home Settings	\$190	\$175	\$175	\$184	-0.9%	5.1%
Hospitalization	\$721	\$730	\$739	\$550	-7.7%	-25.6%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	\$354	\$374	\$349	\$329	-2.3%	-5.7%
All Categories	\$276	\$276	\$271	\$287	1.4%	5.9%

Chart 52



DJS Out of State All Categories Cost Per Bed-Day Trends						
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$184	\$183	\$164	\$0	-37.0%	-100.0%
Family Home Settings	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Hospitalization	\$721	\$730	\$739	\$0	-32.5%	-100.0%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	\$337	\$342	\$342	\$298	-3.8%	-12.9%
All Categories	\$271	\$261	\$243	\$298	4.0%	22.6%

Chart 53

As noted above, it is not possible to accurately disaggregate the costs per bed day by type. So any apparent trends in data in the above chart should not be over-emphasized or over-analyzed.

Conclusion

There are a number of initiatives that DJS has undertaken or continued in the past year, to improve the way youth are identified for, placed into, and served in out-of-home placements.

Multidisciplinary Assessment Staffing Team (MAST):

DJS is currently planning to augment the placement process by creating a specialized diagnostic team responsible for assessing youth prior to court disposition. The new diagnostic process will be fully implemented by late 2012. MAST will assess youth for whom DJS will recommend an out-of-home placement at disposition. The diagnostic team will include a psychologist, social worker, community case manager, resource specialist, Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) representative and representatives from other disciplines as needed. Youth who require more specialized assessments (e.g., a neurological, psycho-sexual, or medical assessment) will be referred for evaluation. Following this in-depth review, the team will submit a report for the juvenile court to consider at disposition, with security and treatment recommendations.

The Continuum of Care and Central Review Committee (CRC):

The initial committed program placement may not be successful. Some youth run away from their placement or are ejected due to misbehavior. The behavioral, emotional, and/or medical needs of youth may also change. New legislation (“Continuum of Care”) was passed during the 2012 Legislative Session (effective June 1, 2012) that authorizes DJS to transfer youth directly from one facility or program to another facility or program (of equal or higher security level) without first asking the court to modify the commitment order. The flexibility to move youth from one program to another is expected to reduce the need for secure detention as youth will no longer be detained pending court review and the subsequent placement decision-making process. This legislation is a key component of a larger reform effort to improve the assessment of youth, create a continuum of care, and establish length of stay guidelines. To manage this process, DJS has established a CRC chaired by the Director of Behavioral Health. This team is responsible for conducting weekly case reviews of youth at risk of removal from a committed residential placement, directing the provision of services, and making placement transfer decisions.

CHALLENGE Program:

DJS operates seven facilities in Maryland. Notably, a new behavioral management program, CHALLENGE, has been implemented in two of these facilities and will be phased-in to the other five facilities by the end of 2012. CHALLENGE provides youth with clear behavioral expectations within a structured daily routine using positive reinforcers. The program is grounded in the principles of positive reinforcement and modeling, and is designed to encourage youth to accept responsibility for their behavior and learn problem-solving and leadership skills. Staff members are being trained to teach and model problem-solving and social skills. CHALLENGE is expected to facilitate order and security within a facility and promote an environment characterized by respect and fairness that is conducive to treatment.

Evidence Based Programs (EBP):

DJS continues to rely on the use of evidence-based programs to divert appropriate youth from out-of-home placements. Evidence based programs include Functional Family Therapy (FFT),

Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST) and Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC). Programs are used primarily as group and therapeutic group home diversion programs for juveniles 12 to 17 years of age.

The Maryland Comprehensive Assessment and Service Planning (MCASP):

The MCASP is an assessment tool used to inform the placement of youth in appropriate programs and services. The MCASP uses integrated case management to assess a youth's risks and needs throughout the course of his involvement with DJS and to develop interventions that accomplish the dual goals of public safety and youth rehabilitation. MCASP enables DJS to strengthen individualized service plans for the youth and his family, place the youth with appropriate services and programs, track the youth's progress, and ensure that each youth receives the level of supervision consistent with his or her risk to public safety.

Silver Oak Academy:

Silver Oak Academy (SOA) is a private residential program owned and operated by Rite of Passage, Inc. This program opened in FY2010 and was brought to full capacity of 48 beds, exclusively for the use of DJS youth, during FY2011. It has helped to fill a critical need for Non-Community-Based committed programming in Maryland.

Assessment of Per-Diem Contracts:

During FY2011, DJS examined all per diem contracts and selected those that seemed to have good outcomes to provide appropriate placements for youths. As a result of this, in FY2012, a few contracts were dropped.

Gaps and Needs

The primary need is for in-State capacity to serve higher-risk DJS youth requiring committed out of home Non-Community-Based placement. Since the closure of Hickey committed programs in 2005, the number of committed children waiting in detention for placement increased, as did the number of youth being served out-of-State. Both populations remain as issues of concern. DJS' comprehensive capital plan includes two in-State facilities that would help fill the need and reduce both pending placement and out-of-State placement; however, neither is slated to be finished for at least three years. In the meantime, DJS continues to seek greater capacity in-State.

DJS continues to assess the needs of female youth through its female intervention teams and task force. In FY2011, DJS took an inventory of all available 'Girls Services' and published statistical information on girls in DJS. The report addressed the number of girls entering DJS at each decision point in the system as well as their male counterparts for comparison purposes.

Highlights

- Over the past four years, youth placed in out-of-home placements have declined by 3.1% from 3,100 placements during FY2009 to 3,005 in FY2012.
- In FY2012, about 86% of the youth placed out-of-home placements are served in Maryland programs, with 14% going out-of-State. This proportion was slightly more in FY2010 with 90%, but remained at 87% in FY2009 and FY2011.
- The overall gender and racial demographic makeup of DJS out-of-home population changed little in the last four years.
- The median age of youth at admission has been gradually increasing from 16.7 in FY2009 to 16.9 in FY2012. This could explain the reason for a slight increase in the over 18 and above population in FY2012 compared to FY2009. The age of youth at exit was 17.1 in FY2009 17.4 in FY2012.
- The overall average length of stay increased from 163 days to 175 days between FY2009 to FY2012, although there was variation in lengths of stay between program types.
- Based on FY2012 out-of-home placements, the majority of youth placed come from Baltimore City (22%), followed by Prince George's (20%), Montgomery (8%), Anne Arundel (9%), and Baltimore (8%) Counties.
- In FY2012, youth served by Non-Community-Based programs constitute approximately 69% of all DJS out-of-home placements, and increased by 7% from FY2009, 5% from FY2010, and 3% from FY2011. Youth in Community-Based placements, however, decreased from 29% in FY2009 to 23% in FY2012.

Recommendations

- Increase in-State capacity for Non-Community-Based programming, through capital projects and through contracting with in-State providers.
- Continue to improve the assessment and placement processes to insure quick and appropriate placement for youth requiring out-of-home care.
- Continue to use evidence-based programs to reduce the need for community-based out of home placements.

Section III: Family Home Settings

Overview

In this section, an analysis of the number of placements for Family Home Settings is discussed. This includes a Statewide summary and analysis by each of the placing/funding Agencies represented in this category. Family Home Settings include the following placements: Relative (Kinship) Care, Foster Care, Treatment Foster Care, Adoptive Care, Individual Family Care, and Living Arrangement – Family Home. A definition of each placement is listed below.

Definitions

- “*Adoptive Care*” - Out-of-home placement services provided to a child when the permanency plan is adoption but an adoptive family is not yet available or the child is not ready for permanent placement.
- “*Formal-Kinship-Care*” - Provides efforts to place children in short-term substitute care with relatives rather than unrelated foster parents when out-of-home placement is required because of abuse, neglect, or abandonment. Formal Kinship Care placements are not paid.
- “*Foster Care*” - Continuous 24-hour care and supportive services provided for a minor child placed by an LDSS. Foster care includes: services to the child’s parent(s) or legal guardian, sibling(s), and relative(s) in order to achieve a safe, permanent placement for the child; supervision of the child in the foster care placement to assure that the placement promotes the child’s physical, emotional, and intellectual growth and well-being; and post-placement services to the child and the child’s caregiver to prevent placement disruption or reentry into out-of-home placement. Foster care placements are made only for children who are abused, neglected, abandoned, or dependent on the State.
- “*Individual Family Care (Individual Family)*” - Individual family care (IFC) is a private, single-family residence that provides a home for up to three individuals with developmental disabilities, who are unrelated to the care provider.
- “*Living Arrangement- Family Home*” - This placement includes children who are returned to their biological caregivers after an out-of-home placement, non-residential living situation for children old enough to live without adult supervision, and “Community-Based behavioral respite,” which are relief services provided by a community residential licensee designed to meet the individual behavioral needs of a child with a serious emotional disability for not more than 30 days in a Community-Based setting.
- “*Restricted Relative Care*” - Similar to Regular Foster Care, however these providers provide care for specific children only.
- “*Treatment Foster Care (TFC)*” - Designed to provide short-term substitute care for children removed from their homes with services to achieve permanency through family reunification or alternative permanent placement when reunification is not possible. TFC placements are made only for children who are abused, neglected, abandoned, or in State custody. These children also need special treatment. Maryland has four levels for treatment.

Family Home Settings Summary





Chart 54



All Agencies Family Home Settings Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Adoptive Care	100	98	60	47	-20.8%	-21.7%
Foster Care	1,552	1,473	1,365	1,327	-5.1%	-2.8%
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	1,558	1,460	1,316	1,207	-8.1%	-8.3%
Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care	1,027	854	634	491	-21.7%	-22.6%
Treatment Foster Care	2,112	2,152	2,100	1,981	-2.1%	-5.7%
Living Arrangement - Family Home	406	453	365	306	-8.0%	-16.2%
Total	6,755	6,490	5,840	5,359	-7.4%	-8.2%

Chart 55

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)

DHR is committed to ensuring that children and youth in out-of-home care are placed in Family Home Settings whenever safe and possible. This is one of the central principles of the Place Matters Initiative, which began in July 2007. Since that time, the percentage of children/youth in Family Home Settings has increased to 76% of total DHR out-of-home population on January 31, 2012. The increase in the percentage of children served in Family Homes has occurred while the number of children in DHR out-of-home care fell significantly: from 10,331 in July 2007 to 6,709 in June 2012.⁴ This represents a 35% decrease.

Family homes (for DHR) are defined as placements in a family setting, and include:

- Adoptive care (pre-finalized adoptive homes);
- Foster care (emergency, intermediate, regular foster care, and respite care);
- Relative/kinship care (paid/restricted/relative and unpaid/formal kinship care);
- Treatment foster care (private and public); and
- Living arrangements (primarily Trial Home Visits with family of origin, but also including own home/apartment).

Over the past four years, the number of children in DHR Family Homes has continued to decrease. As the number of children in DHR out-of-home care has also been decreasing, the percent of children in Family Homes has remained fairly steady, at approximately 75%.

Population Totals




Chart 56

⁴ DHR/SSA State Stat files.


Relative/Kinship Care is divided into two categories – paid and unpaid – although the type of placement and experience for the child is not significantly different and both represent placement with the child’s own relatives, which is always preferable when safe and possible. In both types of placements, children are in the care/custody of the LDSS. Together, these placement categories represent 32% of all DHR Family Home placements, and 24% of all DHR out-of-home placements (based on the one-day count of January 31, 2012). These figures are slightly lower than last year’s percentages of 34% and 25%, respectively.

Foster Care and Treatment Foster Care represent 19% and 27% of all children/youth in DHR Family Homes, respectively. Together these placements account for 46% of all children in DHR out-of-home care. These placements are the least-restrictive placements available to children outside of Relative/Kinship Care or placement with an adoptive family.

As of January 31, 2012, approximately 10% of all children/youth in DHR out-of-home care had a plan of adoption as their permanency plan and approximately 5% were legally free for adoption, meaning their parents’ parental rights have been terminated.⁵ (These percentages are consistent with last year.) Out of all children in Family Homes, 0.9% were in pre-adoptive homes; this represents 0.7% of all children in DHR out-of-home care.

Not all children/youth who are legally free for adoption have a plan of adoption and not all children with a plan of adoption are legally free for adoption. Older youth may be working towards Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA).


DHR utilizes “Living Arrangement” as a data-entry category that contains several different types of placements. In the Family Home category, there are two main types of placements: trial home-visits and own home/apartment. The trial home-visit category includes placements with the child’s parents/family of origin, and represents what others may consider “aftercare” – the time period during which the child is living with his or her parents or family of origin after a period of out-of-home placement but while the child remains under the care/custody of the LDSS. This type of placement is used when the parents/caregivers have demonstrated reduced risk and increased safety, and are preparing for reunification. Older youth may also live in their own home/apartments, either while working or attending college or other job training programs. Together, these categories represent less than 6% of all Family Home placements.



⁵ Source: DHR/SSA State Stat file: 03 Jurisdiction Data – June 2012 – Revised 10-25-12.

DHR Family Home Settings Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Adoptive Care	100	98	60	47	-20.8%	-21.7%
Foster Care	1,547	1,466	1,358	1,321	-5.1%	-2.7%
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	1,558	1,460	1,316	1,207	-8.1%	-8.3%
Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care	1,027	854	634	491	-21.7%	-22.6%
Treatment Foster Care	2,034	2,066	2,032	1,914	-2.0%	-5.8%
Living Arrangement - Family Home	406	453	365	306	-8.0%	-16.2%
Total	6,672	6,397	5,765	5,286	-7.4%	-8.3%

Chart 57



DHR Family Home Settings Placement % Trends				
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012
Adoptive Care	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	0.9%
Foster Care	23.2%	22.9%	23.6%	25.0%
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	23.4%	22.8%	22.8%	22.8%
Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care	15.4%	13.4%	11.0%	9.3%
Treatment Foster Care	30.5%	32.3%	35.2%	36.2%
Living Arrangement - Family Home	6.1%	7.1%	6.3%	5.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chart 58

As stated above, the total number of children in all DHR out-of-home placements continues to decrease, including the number of children placed in Family Homes. The percent of children in Family Homes has remained fairly stable since 2009. The percent changes presented in Chart 58 should be interpreted within the context of the overall decrease of children in care and, in some instances, the data presented in Chart 57 may be more instructive.

The numbers and percentages of children in Adoptive Care continue to decrease as a result of two main factors: one, the commitment of DHR and the LDSSs to work towards reunification and guardianship when possible (in lieu of termination of parental rights and adoption) and two, increased adoptions in fiscal years 2009 and 2010. These two factors – a decrease of children in need of adoptive homes and past efforts to finalize adoptions that may have been previously

delayed – have led to a currently lower number than in the past years of children in pre-adoptive homes.

The percentages of placement types shown in Chart 58 represent trends that have both treatment and funding implications. Within each of the least restrictive Family Home placements – and all out-of-home placements – Adoptive Care, Formal Relative/Kinship Care, Restrictive Relative/Kinship Care, and Living Arrangement/Family Home, there is an average decrease for each year, between 0.9% and 15.5%. The more restrictive Family Home placement types, Foster Care and Treatment Foster Care, both increase on average during each the four years by 2.6% and 5.9%, respectively. In each category, the change from last year follows the four-year trend.

Part of the decrease in the least restrictive placement types is due to increased efforts towards reunification and guardianship. These trends may also be due to improved family preservation efforts, which may keep some children from entering out-of-home care. Another reason for the decrease in less-restrictive placement types is that, clinically, children and youth who are not able to be placed with family typically have more intense needs than children who need the least restrictive level of placement. The result is that additional resources and/or higher skill levels from DHR workers may be required to meet the more intense needs exhibited by children in Family Home Settings, which are less expensive placement types but might require additional funding to support expansion of more family-oriented and low-cost options.


Population Demographics

DHR policy and the Place Matters and Family Centered Practice initiatives prohibit placement of children younger than age 12 in group home placements, and establishes Family Home placements as the preferred setting, when safe and appropriate. In keeping with the policy and initiatives, 98% of all children in out-of-home care aged 5 and under are placed in Family Home Settings, as are 93% of children aged 6 to 11. Of children aged 12 to 17, 25% are placed in Family Homes, and 14% of youth aged 18 and over are in family homes.

Within the category of Family Home placements, 30% of all placements are children aged 5 or under, 19% are children aged 6 to 11, 33% are children aged 12 to 17, and 18% are youth aged 18 and over.

As stated previously, placement of the majority of all young children into Family Homes is consistent with DHR policy and the philosophy that children thrive best when in a family environment. Children aged 12 through 17 encompass the largest proportion of the total DHR out-of-home population, and therefore it is not surprising that this age group represents the largest group within the Family Home category.


The smaller proportion of older youth, compared to all other youth in care, may be attributed to normal life events such as youth leaving care for college and job training programs. Additionally, youth who are in DHR out-of-home care are likely to have experienced some type of abuse or neglect, which can lead to emotional and behavioral issues that are often exacerbated during adolescence. Older children and youth who face intensifying issues require higher levels of placements than Family Homes.



DHR Family Home Settings Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	2,091	1,892	1,622	1,589	-8.6%	-2.0%
6 through 11	1,599	1,386	1,166	984	-14.9%	-15.6%
12 through 17	2,069	2,140	1,960	1,744	-5.3%	-11.0%
18 and over	913	979	1,017	969	2.1%	-4.7%
Total	6,672	6,397	5,765	5,286	-7.4%	-8.3%

Chart 59

All age categories have experienced decreases in total numbers over the past four years, except youth aged 18 and over. This group has had an average four-year increase of 2%, although this does include a nearly 5% decrease in the past year. The overall rise in number of youth over 18 is a result of DHR’s policy to encourage youth who have not exited to permanency by age 18 to remain in care voluntarily until age 21. This allows youth to receive continued support in housing, education, case management, healthcare, and other areas. Maryland was the first state to receive approval for IV-E reimbursement for youth over 18 who remain in care.⁶




DHR Family Home Settings Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	3,377	3,194	2,853	2,568	-8.7%	-10.0%
Female	3,295	3,203	2,911	2,717	-6.2%	-6.7%

⁶ Title IV-E of the Social Security Act.

Unknown	0	0	1	1	NA	0.0%
Total	6,672	6,397	5,765	5,286	-7.4%	-8.3%

Chart 60

The percentage of children/youth in DHR Family Homes by gender continues to remain fairly even, with 49% male and 51% female. As shown in Table 5, there has been a larger decrease in the number of males than females, but this difference had not resulted in a significant difference in the percentages of the two groups. The overall out-of-home population also has a fairly even split between males and females, although slightly more males than females (less than 1%).



DHR Family Home Settings Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	5	5	1	2	6.7%	100.0%
Asian	13	12	14	13	0.6%	-7.1%
Black or African-American	4,845	4,588	3,931	3,479	-10.4%	-11.5%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	1	2	2	2	33.3%	0.0%
White	1,403	1,356	1,384	1,403	0.0%	1.4%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	234	250	227	212	-3.0%	-6.6%
Other	93	113	120	112	7.0%	-6.7%
Unknown	78	71	86	63	-4.9%	-26.7%
Total	6,672	6,397	5,765	5,286	-7.4%	-8.3%

Chart 61

The number of Black or African-American children/youth in Family Home Settings has decreased more significantly than any other racial group, with an overall average four-year decrease of 10%, and a decrease of more than 11% in the last year.


Due to these trends, the gap between the proportion of White and Black or African-American children in Family Homes between 2009 and 2012 lessened⁷:

- In 2009, 73% of all children in Family Homes were Black or African-American, compared to 21% who were White.
- In 2012, these percentages were 66% and 27%, respectively. (These proportions are close to the overall out-of-home population of 67% and 26%, respectively.)

All other racial groups each include 4% or less than the total Family Home population.

⁷ One-day counts (January 31).

Out-of-State Demographics



DHR Out-of-State Family Home Settings Placement Trends


Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Adoptive Care	14	10	9	7	-20.3%	-22.2%
Foster Care	102	83	53	34	-30.2%	-35.8%
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	41	22	26	23	-13.2%	-11.5%
Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care	70	63	44	25	-27.8%	-43.2%
Treatment Foster Care	6	9	9	6	5.6%	-33.3%
Living Arrangement - Family Home	4	0	0	2	NA	NA
Total	237	187	141	97	-25.6%	-31.2%

Chart 62

Each year, less than 4% of all Family Home placements are out-of-State, and that percentage has decreased to 2% for each of the past two years.

The numbers of children in out-of-State Family Home placements are dependent upon individual children’s needs and family situations. Adoptive Care, Formal Relative/Kinship Care, Restricted Relative/Kinship Care, and Living Arrangement (often trial home-visits or own home/apartment) consistently constitute more than 59% of all out-of-State placements in this category. These placements are driven by the family/relative home location, as opposed to resource home availability. This means a child’s relatives or parents may be located in another state, the best fit for an adoptive home may be out-of-State, and/or an older youth may choose to attend college or live (for other reasons) out-of-State. Regardless of these locations, it is nearly always in the child’s best interest to be placed with biological family, with a permanent adoptive family, or to allow the youth to explore his or her educational and career potential.


The Interstate Compact for the Placement of Children (ICPC) ensures that all children in out-of-home care are monitored by the “receiving” states’ workers for safety issues, and Maryland’s workers continue full involvement, monitoring, and support of the child and family.



DHR Out-of-State Family Home Settings Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	89	68	44	28	-31.8%	-36.4%
6 through 11	67	42	29	22	-30.8%	-24.1%
12 through 17	66	64	56	37	-16.5%	-33.9%
18 and over	15	13	12	10	-12.6%	-16.7%
Total	237	187	141	97	-25.6%	-31.2%

Chart 63

Age group proportions for children in out-of-State Family Home Settings are similar to that of all DHR family settings, with the highest percentage of youth in out-of-State aged 12 to 17.




DHR Out of State Family Home Settings Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	110	95	70	46	-24.7%	-34.3%
Female	127	92	71	51	-26.2%	-28.2%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	237	187	141	97	-25.6%	-31.2%

Chart 64

As with the overall Family Home Settings gender split, there are slightly more females than males in out-of-State Family Home Placements. Due to the small number of children/youth in this group, however, caution should be used in interpreting year-to-year changes in the

proportions of male and female, especially as this category is largely driven by child- and family-specific situations, not resource needs.



DHR Out-of-State Family Home Settings Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	1	1	1	0	-33.3%	-100.0%
Black or African-American	150	119	92	63	-25.0%	-31.5%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	75	58	40	28	-27.9%	-30.0%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	5	7	8	4	1.4%	-50.0%
Other	3	0	0	1	NA	NA
Unknown	3	2	0	1	NA	NA
Total	237	187	141	97	-25.6%	-31.2%

Chart 65

According to the one-day count in 2012, approximately 65% of the children in out-of-State Family Homes were Black or African-American, while 29% were White. These proportions are similar to those of the overall Family Home population, but, as stated above, caution should be used in analyzing this data due to the small number of out-of-State Family Home placements and the nature of these placements.⁸

⁸ For all placement tables above, “unknown” indicates that data was not available for extract from MD CHESSIE. In these circumstances, child-specific information was known to the LDSS, but not available in aggregate data.

Placement Costs




Chart 66

DHR placements costs cannot be broken down by placement subcategory. A composite of the total Family Home Settings costs are shown here and include all subcategories except those entered as living arrangement. Typically, living arrangements are a data-entry classification for placements that do not require DHR payment – such as trial home visit or the youth’s own home/apartment.

Total Family Home placement costs (chart 66) have generally decreased over the past four years, with the exception of an increase from FY2009 to FY2010. Overall, however, the costs from FY2009 to FY2012 have decreased by an average of 4.5% per year, with an overall 13% decrease. These decreases are due to the overall declining numbers of children in out-of-home care.




Chart 67

Costs for out-of-State Family Home Placements have decreased more significantly than the overall total Family Home costs, and therefore contribute to the overall reduction in costs. The average yearly decrease has been approximately 23%, resulting in a decrease of 54% from FY2009 to FY2012. This corresponds to the 59% decrease in the number of children in out-of-State Family Home Placements during the same time period.




Chart 68

Per bed-day costs are driven by the total number of children served each year, the types of placements used, and the length of stay of each child in each paid placement type. These factors vary from year to year, with an average increase of 2.6% over the past four years.

Conclusion

Needs

Maryland continues to need resource parents for teens, sibling groups and medically fragile children. Though gains have been made in these areas, especially through educating current resource parents, these types of placements remain the most needed. Recruitment of minority resource parents, in particular Spanish-speaking parents, continues. In many cases, however, potential resource parents who respond to outreach efforts are only interested in younger children or children solely available for adoption.

Highlights

- DHR has made significant reductions in the number of children in DHR out-of-home care since the initiation of the Place Matters Initiative in July 2007, and current Family Centered Practices and other strategies continue to support these efforts. Family Involvement Meetings have been an integral part of reducing the number of children in out-of-home care and increasing the proportion of children in Family Homes. Of those children placed in Family Homes, 39% are placed with their own families, relatives, or adoptive families (Pre-Adoptive Homes, Formal Kinship Care, Restricted

Relative/Kinship Care, Living Arrangement/Family Home (*i.e.*, trial home visit or own home/apartment)).


- Approximately 75% of all children in DHR out-of-home care are placed in Family Homes, reflecting the success of the Place Matters Initiative in keeping children in Family Homes. The total number of children in Family Home Placements, however, has decreased along with the total out-of-home population.
- The largest age group in DHR Family Home Placements is 12 to 17 year olds (33%), and Black or African-American children/youth constitute approximately 68% of all children in this category. The proportions of males and females are nearly equal. Approximately 98% of all children under age 6 and 93% of all children aged 6 to 11 in DHR out-of-home care are in Family Home Placements.

Recommendations

Placement needs are highest for children with special needs, and older youth. DHR will continue to look for alternatives to congregate (group home) placements when appropriate for specific children, and will increase efforts to place children in public Foster Care homes in lieu of Treatment Foster Care homes when possible. Statewide efforts to provide community-based and supportive services to children with intensive needs should be continued.

DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS)

Population Totals




DJS Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2012	
Subcategory	Placements
Adoptive Care	0
Foster Care	6
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	0
Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care	0
Treatment Foster Care	67
Living Arrangement - Family Home	0

Chart 69

Family home settings include Foster Care (FC) and Treatment Foster Care (TFC) youth. Foster Care serves the low risk youth who cannot be managed in their own homes, so continuous care and support services are provided by DJS-approved family homes.


Treatment Foster Care provides 24-hour home care and intensive support services in family settings for a youth with serious emotional, medical and psychological conditions. Foster Parents usually receive extensive pre-service training and in-service supervision and support; they have been trained to work with a youth of special needs. Treatment Foster Homes are generally clustered within a program under the oversight and management of a mental health professional or specialist trained in dealing with these youth. Frequent contact between foster parents and professionals and specialist is expected.

Of the total 957 out-of-home residential population, 73 youth or 8% are in family home settings. Out of 73 youth, 67 youth were in Treatment Foster Care as of 1/31/2012.



DJS Family Home Settings Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Adoptive Care	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Foster Care	5	7	7	6	8.6%	-14.3%
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Treatment Foster Care	78	86	68	67	-4.0%	-1.5%
Living Arrangement - Family Home	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	83	93	75	73	-3.3%	-2.7%

Chart 70




DJS Family Home Settings Placement % Trends				
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012
Foster Care	6.0%	7.5%	9.3%	8.2%
Treatment Foster Care	94.0%	92.5%	90.7%	91.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chart 71

The DJS population of youth in Foster Care has remained low – in the single digits – over the past four years. This population makes up a small but steady portion of the DJS out-of-home census. Youth in Treatment Foster Care constitutes a much more significant part of the population, though use has declined somewhat in the past few years.

The increase or decrease in population for one-day counts does not provide a true picture for the overall FY trend. Data for FY2012 as a whole indicates a fairly large decline in the number of youth placed into Foster Care (both family and treatment), from 118 in FY2010 to 92 in FY2012. Lengths of stay did increase somewhat in FY2012. The overall average daily population dropped from 82 in FY2010 to 62 in FY2012. Full FY2012 data is available in the DJS Data Resource Guide FY2012.


Population Demographics:



DJS Family Home Settings Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
12 through 17	47	60	42	33	-7.9%	-21.4%
18 and over	36	33	33	40	4.3%	21.2%
Total	83	93	75	73	-3.3%	-2.7%

Chart 72


Youth over 18 went from 28% of the population in FY2010 to 42% in FY2012, for Foster and Treatment Foster Care.



DJS Family Home Settings Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	66	68	57	52	-7.3%	-8.8%
Female	17	25	18	21	11.9%	16.7%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	83	93	75	73	-3.3%	-2.7%

Chart 73

There were no significant changes in the gender makeup of youth in Foster Care or Treatment Foster Care.



DJS Family Home Settings Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	1	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Black or African-American	54	62	47	43	-6.0%	-8.5%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	24	25	23	25	1.6%	8.7%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	4	4	5	4	1.7%	-20.0%
Unknown	1	1	0	1	NA	NA
Total	83	93	75	73	-3.3%	-2.7%


Chart 74

Interestingly, over the past four years minority youth representation in the Family Home setting placement type has declined. In the above census counts, the African-American youth population decreased from 65% in FY2009 to 59% in FY2012. This trend is also reflected in the full annual data. (“Unknown” category means race is not known for that youth or data was not entered in the DJS ASSIST system.)

Out-of-State Demographics

All DJS youth in Foster Care and Treatment Foster Care are served in-State Only.


Placement Costs



DJS Family Home Settings Total Cost Trends						
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Foster Care	\$68,129	\$89,467	\$75,732	\$85,937	9.8%	13.5%
Treatment Foster Care	\$5,100,113	\$4,845,688	\$4,521,812	\$4,432,057	-4.6%	-2.0%
Total	\$5,168,242	\$4,935,155	\$4,597,544	\$4,517,994	-4.4%	-1.7%

Chart 75

A note on DJS expenditure data: Program billing data often comes from payments to programs that operate units across more than one category of service. Thus, an invoice may, for example, cover a payment for bed days of youth in Treatment Foster Care, Group Home, and Independent Living programs. It is not possible at this time to dis-aggregate the cost information accurately between program units, so expenditures at the individual program type level will not show accurate or meaningful trends.



DJS Family Home Settings Cost Per Bed-Day Trends						
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Foster Care	\$56	\$37	\$36	\$41	-7.6%	13.9%
Treatment Foster Care	\$196	\$189	\$186	\$197	0.3%	5.9%
Total	\$190	\$175	\$175	\$184	-0.9%	5.1%

Chart 76

As noted above, it is not possible to accurately disaggregate the costs per bed day by type. Any apparent trends in data in the above table should not be over-emphasized or over-analyzed.

Conclusion

Gaps and Needs

With diversion programs available, DJS continues to place a low number of children in Foster Care or Therapeutic Foster Care. DJS provides an array of Non-Residential services including the evidence-based MST and FFT programs for those children who can remain at home.

Highlights

- Over the past four years, approximately 8% of placements were committed placements to family home settings.
- Minority youth representation in family home setting placements declined over the past four years, though they continue to make up 66% of the total placed population.
- The average age at the time of placement increased from 16.9 in FY2009 to 17.1 in FY2012.

Recommendations

- Continue to assess and identify youth for service by evidence-based programs such as MST and FFT as a diversion from out-of-home care.

Section IV: Community-Based Residential Programs

Overview

An analysis of the number of placements for Community-Based Residential Programs is discussed in this section and includes a summary and analysis by each of the placing/funding Agencies represented in this category. Community-Based Residential Programs include the following placements: Independent Living, Community-Supported Living Arrangement (CSLA), and Residential Child Care Programs (RCCPs). Each of these placements is defined below.

Definitions

- “*Alternative Living Unit (ALU)*” - A program that provides services in a structured, staff-supervised home licensed by DHMH/DDA for individuals who, because of developmental disability, require specialized care. The service setting is one to three developmentally-delayed children with systemic problems.
- “*Community-Supported Living Arrangement (CSLA)*” - A residence:
 - (a) Which is rented or owned by an individual or the individual’s family or proponent or held in trust for an individual;
 - (b) Where an individual lives as a roommate without the individual’s name appearing on the lease or title; or
 - (c) For which the licensee is the guarantor of rental or mortgage payments for an individual receiving CSLA services.

Services are provided to assist an individual in non-vocational activities necessary to enable that individual to live in the individual’s own home, apartment, Family Home, or rental unit, with (i) No more than two other nonrelated recipients of these services; or (ii) Members of the same family regardless of their number.

CSLA includes:

- (i) Personal assistance services;
- (ii) Supports that enhance the individual’s opportunity for community participation and to exercise choice and control over the individual’s own life;
- (iii) Training and other services necessary to assist the individual in achieving and maintaining increased integration, interdependence, and productivity;
- (iv) 24-hour emergency assistance;
- (v) Assistive technology;
- (vi) Adaptive equipment;
- (vii) Resource coordination;
- (viii) Environmental modifications;
- (ix) Respite services; and
- (x) Other services as approved by the Secretary or the Secretary’s designee.

- “*DDA Group Home*” - A residence owned, leased, or operated by a DDA licensee that: (a) Provides residential services for individuals who, because of a developmental disability, require specialized living arrangements; (b) Admits at least four individuals but not more than eight; and (c) Provides ten or more hours of supervision per unit, per week.
- “*Group Home*” - Services provided to children who need more supervision than a relative, foster parent or treatment foster parent can provide. A program that provides varying levels of care based on the abilities, disabilities and functioning of children referred and placed.
- “*High Intensity Group Home*” - A group home that provides services to children presenting emotional and/or behavioral conditions requiring a higher level of structured supervision, behavior management and clinical intervention.
- “*Independent Living Programs*” - Independent living programs must operate under the auspices of a child-placement Agency licensed by the DHR Office of Licensing and Monitoring in accordance with Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 07.05.01 and 07.05.04. These programs are designed for older children mature enough to function autonomously for the most part. Children live in apartments and attend college, high school, trade schools, or engage in other training preparation programs with minimal Agency supervision. The programs are designed to teach self-sufficiency and independent living skills because of the unlikelihood of the child returning home. Children may reside in a Foster Care home or group home, including a supervised apartment unit, and must be enrolled in high school, college, vocational training, or be employed.
- “*Living Arrangements - Community-Based*” - Includes placements in an institution of higher learning. Children in this category typically live on-campus, a halfway house, temporary shelter placement for homeless children, or a residential program for job training.
- “*Medically Fragile Program (MFP)*” - A program designed to serve a child who is dependent upon any combination of the following: mechanical ventilation for at least part of each day; intravenous administration of nutritional substances or drug; other device-based respiratory or nutritional support on a daily basis, including tracheotomy tube care, suctioning, or oxygen support; other medical devices that compensate for vital body functions; including apnea or cardio- respiratory monitors; renal dialysis; or other mechanical devices; or substantial nursing care in connection with disabilities.
- “*Residential Child Care Programs (RCCP)*” - Provides 24-hour per day care for children with a structured set of services and activities that are designed to achieve specific objectives relative to the needs of the children served. These programs include the provision of food, clothing, shelter, education, social services, health, mental health, recreation, or any combination of these services and activities. An RCCP includes those that are licensed by DHMH, DHR, or DJS, and are subject to the regulations governing the operation of RCCPs.
- “*Respite Program*” - Temporary care provided in a substitute care setting. The purpose may be to give relief to the caregiver, to regulate or change a child’s medication or treatment plan or to provide care while a child is awaiting permanent placement.

- “*Shelter Program*” - Temporary care in an out-of-home placement due to serious allegations of parental abuse or neglect. Stays generally last from 30 to 90 days or until a court can determine whether a more permanent placement is appropriate.
- “*Teen Mother Program*” - A licensed residential program that provides care and services for children who are mothers with an infant.
- “*Therapeutic Group Home*” - Services provided in a home (for 4 to 8 children) licensed by the DHMH Office of Health Care Quality for children that need structure and supervision due to medically-diagnosed disorders such as emotional disturbance, schizophrenia, or bi-polar disorder. It includes a formal program of basic care, social work, mental health and health care services, which can include the daily administration of medicine.

Community-Based Residential Placements Summary





Chart 77



All Agencies Community-Based Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	217	261	234	213	0.3%	-9.0%
Residential Child Care Program	1,625	1,264	1,105	1,108	-11.5%	0.3%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	135	117	96	84	-14.6%	-12.5%
Living Arrangement - Community Based	58	76	79	60	3.6%	-24.1%
Total	2,035	1,718	1,514	1,465	-10.2%	-3.2%

Chart 78


DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)

DHR is committed to serving each child/youth in a Family Home setting whenever safe and possible, and this is the central tenet of DHR's Place Matters Initiative. There are times, however, when Community-Based Placements are the least restrictive and most appropriate placement. Community-Based Placements constituted 16% of all DHR out-of-home placements on January 31, 2012.

DHR Community-Based Placements include independent living programs, group homes, and additional placements that are not unique to children in care, such as college and Job Corps. Group homes often serve specialized populations, and these placements include:


- Alternative Living Units
- Emergency Group Shelter Care
- Residential Group Home
- Teen Mother Programs
- Therapeutic Group Homes

Population Totals



DHR Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2012	
Subcategory	Placements
Independent Living Programs	197
Residential Child Care Program	859
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	0
Living Arrangement - Community Based	60


Chart 79



DHR Community-Based Placement Trends

Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	195	229	205	197	1.0%	-3.9%
Residential Child Care Program	1,396	1,016	886	859	-14.4%	-3.0%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Community Based	58	76	79	60	3.6%	-24.1%
Total	1,649	1,321	1,170	1,116	-12.0%	-4.6%

Chart 80



DHR Community-Based Placement % Trends

Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012
Independent Living Programs	11.8%	17.3%	17.5%	17.7%
Residential Child Care Program	84.7%	76.9%	75.7%	77.0%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Living Arrangement - Community Based	3.5%	5.8%	6.8%	5.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chart 81


The number of Community-Based Placements has continued to decrease since 2009, with an average annual decrease of 12%. As the out-of-home population in general has decreased and more children are served in Family Home Settings, the total decrease in the number of children/youth in Community-Based settings has decreased 32%. After an initial (numerical and

percentage) increase from 2009 to 2010, the percent of youth in independent living programs has remained steady at approximately 17.5% of all Community-Based Placements. Although the number of youth in this placement type decreased slightly in 2012, it is probable that this number may either remain steady or increase again, as DHR encourages youth at age 18 (who have not exited to permanency) to remain in care until age 21. This allows youth to receive support in areas such as housing, education, healthcare, case management, etc.

Group home (Residential Child Care Provider/RCCP) placements continue to constitute the majority of DHR’s Community-Based population, with 77% of all Community-Based Placements on January 31, 2012. The overall number of these placements, however, continues to decline significantly, with an average annual decrease of 14% (Table 2), and an overall decrease of 38%.

“Living arrangement - Community-Based” is a data-entry category of other Community-Based Placements which generally do not require funding by DHR, such as college, Job Corps, and other placements. These placement types remain a small percentage of all Community-Based Placements.

Population Demographics




DHR Community-Based Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	15	4	1	6	117.2%	500.0%
6 through 11	116	71	34	36	-28.3%	5.9%
12 through 17	914	610	510	475	-18.8%	-6.9%
18 and over	604	636	625	599	-0.2%	-4.2%
Total	1,649	1,321	1,170	1,116	-12.0%	-4.6%

Chart 82

As would be expected, very few children under age 12 are in a Community-Based placement. The majority are youth aged 18 and over, as DHR encourages youth turning 18 to remain in care if they have yet not exited to a permanent placement.

Of all children in DHR out-of-home care aged 12 to 17, 19% are in Community-Based Placements. Of all youth in DHR out-of-home care aged 18 and over, 32% are in Community-


Based Placements. These percentages reflect both a continued need for this placement type for children and youth over age 12, but also increased Community-Based supports and foster homes with the ability and willingness to care for these youth. While certainly some youth need the more intensive structure and services provided by group homes, there is also a need for foster parents willing and able to care for older youth who may be appropriate for placement in a lower level of care.



DHR Community-Based Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	969	779	702	647	-12.4%	-7.8%
Female	680	542	468	469	-11.2%	0.2%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	1,649	1,321	1,170	1,116	-12.0%	-4.6%

Chart 83

Unlike the DHR placement population as a whole, there is a discrepancy between male and female representation in Community-Based Placements, with approximately 59% of children/youth being male.




DHR Community-Based Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	2	1	1	0	-50.0%	-100.0%
Asian	9	8	10	6	-8.7%	-40.0%
Black or African-American	1,190	915	841	766	-13.4%	-8.9%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	2	2	1	1	-16.7%	0.0%
White	369	318	267	284	-7.8%	6.4%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	42	33	26	35	-2.7%	34.6%
Other	20	17	11	17	1.4%	54.5%
Unknown	15	27	13	7	-6.0%	-46.2%
Total	1,649	1,321	1,170	1,116	-12.0%	-4.6%

Chart 84

As of January 31, 2012, of children/youth in DHR Community-Based Placements, 69% are Black or African-American, and 25% are White. This represents a slightly larger gap between the two races than in the overall DHR out-of-home population (67% Black or African-American, 26% White).

Over the past four years (one-day counts), there have been overall decreases in the number of children from both racial groups, although a slight increase (6.4%, Table 6) in the number of White children/youth in 2012.

Out-of-State Demographics




DHR Out of State Community-Based Placement Trends

Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Child Care Program	65	47	44	38	-15.9%	-13.6%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Community Based	2	1	1	1	-16.7%	0.0%
Total	67	48	45	39	-16.0%	-13.3%

Chart 85

As with the overall DHR out-of-home population, the numbers of children in out-of-State Community-Based Programs continue to decrease. Nearly all children in this category are in group homes, and the policies and practices to ensure that children are in Family Home Settings and close to their homes (when safe and possible) have positively influenced these decreases.




DHR Out of State Community-Based Age Trends

Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	0	1	1	NA	0.0%
12 through 17	32	18	23	18	-12.6%	-21.7%
18 and over	35	30	21	20	-16.3%	-4.8%
Total	67	48	45	39	-16.0%	-13.3%

Chart 86


As with all Community-Based placements, the majority of youth are 12 or over, with a fairly even distribution between the youth aged 12 to 17 and 18 to 21.



DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	44	28	29	25	-15.5%	-13.8%
Female	23	20	16	14	-15.2%	-12.5%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	67	48	45	39	-16.0%	-13.3%

Chart 87

Males constituted 64% of all children/youth placed in DHR out-of-home/out-of-State Community-Based Placements on January 31, 2012. This is a higher percentage of males than in the overall DHR out-of-home population or the DHR out-of-home Community-Based population, and may indicate a lack of placement resources. The continued decline in out-of-State Community-Based Placements, however, may indicate that these placement resource challenges are being addressed.




DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	1	1	1	0	-33.3%	-100.0%
Black or African-American	26	24	26	21	-6.2%	-19.2%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	34	21	17	16	-21.1%	-5.9%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	4	0	1	2	NA	100.0%
Other	2	0	0	0	NA	NA
Unknown	0	2	0	0	NA	NA
Total	67	48	45	39	-16.0%	-13.3%

Chart 88

Over the past four years (one-day counts), the percentage of Black or African-American children in DHR out-of-home/out-of-State Community-Based Placements has fluctuated between 39% and 58%, with White children’s percentages fluctuating between 38% and 51%. Given the small numbers of children in this placement category (under 50 for three years), it is difficult to determine if these fluctuations indicate meaningful trends. Caution should be taken when interpreting this data.⁹


⁹ For all placement tables above, “unknown” indicates that data was not available for extract from MD CHESSIE. In these circumstances, child-specific information was known to the LDSS, but not available in aggregate data.

Placement Costs



DHR Community-Based Total Cost Trends						
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Total	\$156,230,898	\$115,833,311	\$93,862,100	\$89,645,537	-16.4%	-4.5%


Chart 89



DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Total Cost Trends						
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Total	\$4,668,352	\$2,472,515	\$6,167,030	\$6,481,015	35.8%	5.1%


Chart 90

The combination of reductions in both bed-day costs and number of children in Community-Based Placements has led to substantial reductions in placement costs. There has been a 43% reduction in costs for Community-Based Placements since FY2009 and this has been a significant factor in the overall reduction in DHR placement costs.



DHR Community-Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends						
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Total	\$281	\$250	\$229	\$234	-5.8%	1.9%

Chart 91



DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends						
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Total	\$196	\$132	\$353	\$380	47.6%	7.9%

Chart 92

In-State per bed-day costs have reduced more significantly than out-of-State per bed-day costs, with out-of-State per bed-day costs more expensive than in-State. In FY2012, the out-of-State cost was \$380 per bed-day, versus \$234 per in-State bed-day. Despite the overall reduction in out-of-State placements, out-of-State costs have increased an average of 36% annually since FY2009. Part of this is likely due to the difference in proportions of placement types - there is a much higher proportion of RCCP placement in out-of-State than in-State, which also has placements in independent living programs and living arrangements (living arrangements usually do not require DHR funding).

Conclusion


There has been an overall reduction in the number of children in Community-Based Placements, due to the overall reduction of the DHR out-of-home population and the increased priority on placing children/youth in Family Home Settings when safe and appropriate. Children/youth in Community-Based settings constitute approximately 16% of DHR's out-of-home population. Race breakdowns are similar to that of the general DHR out-of-home population, although the age breakdown is skewed toward older youth, males, and Black or African-Americans.

Data show that out-of-State placements are more costly than in-State placements, and although the number of out-of-State placements continues to decline, there appears to remain a need for out-of-State Community-Based Placements, especially for males. This may indicate a need for additional Community-Based resources in Maryland.

Overall, the overrepresentation of males and Black or African-Americans, and the high proportion of youth aged 12 and over, may indicate a need for specialized services and expanded supports to foster parents to create alternative placement options.¹⁰

¹⁰ DHR's Place Matters indicators focus on group home placements only (not all Community-Based Placements), so data from DHR Place Matters reports cannot be directly compared to the data presented.

DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS)




DJS Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2012	
Subcategory	Placements
Independent Living Programs	16
Residential Child Care Program	238
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	0
Living Arrangement - Community Based	0

Chart 93

The above Community-Based Placement population chart includes Independent Living and Residential Child Care Programs. The latter includes DJS youth placed in Alternative Living Units (ALU), Groups Homes (GH), and Therapeutic Group Homes (TGH).


Independent Living Unit (ILU) Programs prepare youth to live on their own and generally some youth from Group Homes and Therapeutic Group Homes are placed prior to home release. Group Homes and Therapeutic Group Homes are residential facilities located in the community that provide out-of-home services for four or more moderate to high risk youth. Youth generally need more structure and supervision than a relative, Foster Home or Treatment Foster Home could offer. Alternative Living Units are for the youth with developmental disabilities. (Source: Gap Analysis Report published March 9, 2009).

Of the total 957 out-of-home residential population, 254 or 27% are Community Based Placements.



DJS Community-Based Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	16	20	20	16	1.7%	-20.0%
Residential Child Care Program	222	248	217	238	3.0%	9.7%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Community Based	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	238	268	237	254	2.7%	7.2%

Chart 94




DJS Community-Based Placement % Trends				
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012
Independent Living Programs	6.7%	7.5%	8.4%	6.3%
Residential Child Care Program	93.3%	92.5%	91.6%	93.7%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Living Arrangement - Community Based	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chart 95

Although there is an apparent slight increase in the census of youth placed into Community-Based committed programs, this is not representative of an overall major increase in usage, which has actually remained relatively unchanged over the past four years.


Population Demographics



DJS Community-Based Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
12 through 17	192	211	174	196	1.7%	12.6%
18 and over	46	57	63	58	8.8%	-7.9%
Total	238	268	237	254	2.7%	7.2%

Chart 96


The large majority of youth served in all DJS committed programs fall within the 12 to 17 age category, with a few older youth over the age of 18. There is a slight increase in the number of youth aged 18 and over served in the one-day census counts provided for this Report, but a review of annual placements does not indicate that this reflects an overall trend. Minority youth make up between 18% and 25% of the population, and though this has fluctuated over the past four years, this does not indicate significant demographic trends.



DJS Community-Based Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	191	213	189	197	1.5%	4.2%
Female	47	55	48	57	7.7%	18.8%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	238	268	237	254	2.7%	7.2%

Chart 97

A review of annual data shows that the number and proportion of youth in this category who are female has increased modestly in the past few years: by around 8% overall.



DJS Community-Based Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	1	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	1	1	0	0	NA	NA
Black or African-American	169	205	182	185	3.9%	1.6%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	60	54	42	60	3.5%	42.9%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	7	7	11	9	13.0%	-18.2%
Unknown	0	1	2	0	NA	-100.0%


Chart 98

Youth identified in the DJS ASSIST case management system as “Hispanic/Latino” are counted here in the “Other” category.

Out-of-State Demographics

There are virtually no youth placed by DJS in out-of-State placements that qualify as Community-Based. On January 31, 2010 only one young woman was in the Adelphi Village Specialized Independent Living Program, and another youth was being served by Mid-Atlantic Youth Services – Intensive Open Residential Treatment (Group Home) Program, which serves as a step-down program for youth transitioning out of the provider’s secure program.


Placement Costs



DJS Community-Based Total Cost Trends						
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	\$2,735,959	\$2,950,676	\$4,318,540	\$2,197,844	1.7%	-49.1%
Residential Child Care Program	\$23,498,721	\$24,560,987	\$23,549,308	\$19,436,207	-5.7%	-17.5%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	\$620,343	\$1,366,125	\$1,658,959	\$0	13.9%	-100.0%
Total	\$26,855,023	\$28,877,788	\$29,526,807	\$21,634,051	-5.7%	-26.7%

Chart 99

A note on DJS expenditure data: Program billing data often comes from payments to programs that operate units across more than one category of service. Thus, an invoice may, for example, cover a payment for bed days of youth in Treatment Foster Care, Group Home, and Independent Living programs. It is not possible at this time to dis-aggregate the cost information accurately between program units, so expenditures at the individual program type level will not show accurate or meaningful trends.



DJS Community-Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends						
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	\$204	\$203	\$225	\$222	3.0%	-1.3%
Residential Child Care Program	\$219	\$218	\$216	\$234	2.3%	8.3%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	\$252	\$258	\$244	\$0	-34.3%	-100.0%
Total	\$218	\$218	\$219	\$233	2.3%	6.4%

Chart 100

As noted above, it is not possible to accurately disaggregate the costs per bed day by type. Any apparent trends in data in the above table should not be over-emphasized or over-analyzed.

Conclusion

Over the past four years there was little change in the population of DJS youth served in Community-Based programs, in either number or demographic makeup.

Gaps and Needs

The primary focus in this area for DJS over the past four years has been to divert lower risk youth from out-of-home placements by diverting children through participation in MST and FFT programs where they can be served in-home. Additionally, Community-Based Programs have been targeted for use as step-down placements for youth released from secure committed placements. DJS does not foresee the need for increases in this type of programming in the near future.

Highlights


- Over the past four years, youth in committed Community-Based Programs account for just over a quarter of DJS's committed out-of-home population.
- Male youth account for four out of five DJS placements in Community-Based Programs over the past four years.
- Over the past four years, White youth make up just a quarter of all DJS youth in Community-Based Programs.
- The average age at the time of placement increased from 16.5 in FY2009 to 16.8 in FY2012.

Recommendation

- Continue to divert DJS group home population through the use of in-home evidence-based programs such as MST and FFT.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES ADMINISTRATION (DDA)


Population Totals



DDA Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2012	
Subcategory	Placements
Independent Living Programs	0
Residential Child Care Program	11
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	84
Living Arrangement - Community Based	0


Chart 101

The Developmental Disabilities Administration (DDA) considers families to be the primary support for children with developmental and intellectual disabilities. Families and caregivers are the constants in the lives of children and they should be seen as the experts regarding their children. DDA recognizes that families and caregivers may need supports from formal and informal networks to assist them in meeting their unique and varied needs, as well as to provide their children with the chance to reach their full potential as they grow up. DDA provides a coordinated service delivery system so that individuals with developmental and intellectual disabilities receive appropriate services oriented toward the goal of integration into the community. These services are provided through a combination of State residential centers and a wide array of Community-Based services delivered primarily through a network of non-profit providers. As demonstrated in the chart above, the highest number of placements occurs in CSLAs. This is a more natural home model which DDA promotes with its mission.



DDA Community-Based Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	6	12	9	0	-8.3%	-100.0%
Residential Child Care Program	7	0	2	11	NA	450.0%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	135	117	96	84	-14.6%	-12.5%
Living Arrangement - Community Based	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	148	129	107	95	-13.7%	-11.2%

Chart 102



DDA Community-Based Placement % Trends				
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012
Independent Living Programs	4.1%	9.3%	8.4%	0.0%
Residential Child Care Program	4.7%	0.0%	1.9%	11.6%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	91.2%	90.7%	89.7%	88.4%
Living Arrangement - Community Based	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chart 103

As shown in Chart 103, DDA out-of-home placements have decreased by an average of 13.7% since the end of FY2009 to FY2012. Between FY2011 and FY2012 there was an overall 11.2% decrease in the number of placements. The continued reduction may be a result of two distinct


factors: DDA continuing its work to provide services to children within the Family Home and its more recent focus to ensure that children needing out-of-home placement access all entitlement services prior to accessing DDA funds for services. DDA has had fewer children come into its placement in the past four years.

Population Flow

DDA Placement Population Flow - All Placements (count of placements, not children)					
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Total Served	Ends in FY (Placement Exits)	Placements at End of FY
2010	136	33	169	29	140
2011	116	36	152	28	124
2012	102	71	173	34	139
Two Year Change	-25.0%	115.2%	2.4%	17.2%	-0.7%
Average Yearly Change	-12.5%	57.6%	1.2%	8.6%	-0.4%
Recent Year Change	-12.1%	97.2%	13.8%	21.4%	12.1%

Chart 104


As stated earlier, DDA is continuing its work to provide services to children within the Family Home and endeavors to ensure that children needing out-of-home placement access all entitlement services prior to accessing DDA funds for services. DDA has had fewer children come into its placement in the past four years. With this decrease, there has also been a decrease in the number of beds that are needed.



DDA Total Served						
	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Family Home	1	0	0	0	NA	NA
Community-Based	192	169	152	173	-2.7%	13.8%
Total	193	169	152	173	-2.9%	13.8%

Chart 105


Population Demographics



DDA Community-Based Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	1	1	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	13	9	6	6	-21.4%	0.0%
12 through 17	69	53	43	37	-18.7%	-14.0%
18 and over	65	66	58	52	-7.0%	-10.3%
Total	148	129	107	95	-13.7%	-11.2%

Chart 106


Chart 106 shows that on January 31 of the four years, the majority of children funded by DDA who reside in out-of-home placements are age 18 and over. The percentage of children aged 0 to 11 who receive funding from DDA for out-of-home placement is lower than the other age groups. This may be attributed to the fact that other State systems are the primary funding source for supporting infants and young children outside of the home.



DDA Community-Based Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	93	82	65	62	-12.4%	-4.6%
Female	55	47	42	33	-15.5%	-21.4%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	148	129	107	95	-13.7%	-11.2%

Chart 107

Chart 107 shows that the number of male and female children receiving funding for out-of-home placement continues to be a greater number of males than females. Overall, the number of children being supported has decreased by 13.7%.



DDA Community-Based Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	1	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	1	1	1	1	0.0%	0.0%
Black or African-American	32	33	26	21	-12.4%	-19.2%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	46	32	26	28	-13.8%	7.7%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	1	NA	NA
Other	50	45	36	25	-20.2%	-30.6%
Unknown	18	18	18	19	1.9%	5.6%
Total	148	129	107	95	-13.7%	-11.2%

Chart 108


Chart 108 shows that, over the four-year period, children who are Black or African-American, White, and categorized under the “Other” category (encapsulating children identifying as Hispanic only) are the three most common race groups receiving services from DDA. Some children’s race information is labeled as “Unknown” either because the applications received by DDA are from the family or the individual who will be receiving services who does not complete all of the demographic information or because the application is submitted by a person who may not have all of the demographic information.

Placement by Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement % of children statewide in placements from jurisdiction		Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																									
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	2	2.1%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	3	3.2%	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	16	16.8%	0	0	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	8	8.4%	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	1	1.1%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	2	2.1%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	7	7.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	1	1.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	2	2.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	1	1.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	1	1.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	4	4.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	29	30.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	8	8.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	1	1.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	1	1.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	3	3.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	5	5.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	95	100.0%	2	3	17	7	1	2	7	1	2	1	0	0	1	4	0	29	8	1	0	1	0	3	5	0	0	0
% of children from			100.0%	100.0%	87.5%	62.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all			2.1%	3.2%	17.9%	7.4%	1.1%	2.1%	7.4%	1.1%	2.1%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	4.2%	0.0%	30.5%	8.4%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	3.2%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Chart 109

DDA believes that supports should be offered within the context of the family and the community in which the child lives, rather than in a segregated setting. While it is DDA's goal to place children close to their families (within their jurisdiction) this is sometimes not possible due to a lack of providers in the child's jurisdiction that are licensed to provide supports . This can be seen in the above chart in Baltimore County and Baltimore City. In these instances, DDA provides services in a close radius to the child's home jurisdiction.




DDA Out-of-State Community-Based Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Child Care Program	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	1	1	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Community Based	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	1	1	0	0	NA	NA

Chart 110

DDA tries to place children in services that are close to their families. DDA is committed to individualized, flexible, family centered and family directed services. To accomplish this, DDA tries to place children in their home jurisdiction. If that cannot occur, DDA collaborates with other Agencies responsible for the welfare of children. DDA has representatives that serve on multiple interagency and intra-agency boards, coordinating councils, committees, and task forces at the State and local levels. These representatives help to ensure that services are coordinated and share resources for children. In addition, arrangements for co-funding of interagency service plans are made for children who qualify for services through multiple Agencies in order to maximize available resources.


Placement Costs



DDA Community-Based Total Cost Trends						
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Residential Child Care Program	\$818,583	\$1,931,304	\$1,751,912	\$2,969,157	65.4%	69.5%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	\$5,179,937	\$3,307,332	\$2,823,561	\$2,939,145	-15.6%	4.1%
Total	\$5,998,520	\$5,238,636	\$4,575,473	\$5,908,302	1.3%	29.1%

Chart 111

Chart 111 shows an increase in the cost of placement in the last four years. The cost has increased due to increases in the national average cost of living and nominal increases in the use of RCCP placements. The total costs for Residential Child Care Program (RCCP) placements and Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA) placements are nearly the same in FY2012. As shown in the DDA Community-Based Placement chart above (Chart 102), in the past four years DDA has had more placements in CSLAs than in any other category.



DDA Community-Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends						
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Residential Child Care Program	\$280	\$322	\$328	\$358	8.7%	9.1%
Community Service Living Arrangement (CSLA)	\$92	\$72	\$72	\$87	-0.3%	20.8%
Total	\$102	\$101	\$103	\$140	12.3%	35.9%

Chart 112

The cost of providing supports to a child in an RCCP is much higher than providing support to a child in a CSLA. In FY2010 and FY2011 the cost to provide supports in a CSLA remained the same, with an increase of 20.8% in the last year. Over the last four years there has been a steady increase in the cost to support a child in an RCCP.

Conclusion:

Resource Development

The greatest challenge to the DDA system continues to be the identification and support of children between the ages of 18 to 21 who are aging out of other support systems. The identification of these children to allow for transition planning is critical to an effective transition process. Incompatible data systems between Administrations and confidentiality issues create barriers to this process.

DDA collaborates with other Agencies responsible for the welfare of children. DDA representatives serve on multiple interagency and intra-agency boards, coordinating councils, committees, and task forces at the State and local levels to coordinate and share resources for children. In addition, arrangements for co-funding of interagency service plans may be made for children who qualify for services through multiple Agencies in order to maximize available resources.

- DDA, in concert with DHR, has developed a comprehensive Memorandum of Understanding that will enable DDA to improve planning for youth transitioning out of the DHR system. The plan also indicates a commitment to cross-train both DDA and DHR staff at least annually.

Summary & Recommendations

Data Summary

- Since FY2009, DDA has decreased the cost of providing Community-Based services to children.
- Since FY2009, DDA has decreased the number of children that are in out-of-home placements.
- For FY2011, DDA was able to provide out-of-home placements, for the majority of children, in each child's home jurisdiction.

Recommendations

- DDA will continue to work with other Administrations and generic community resources to assist children to remain in their homes. DDA works in conjunction with other state and local agencies to assess the community's capacity to meet the ongoing needs of children with developmental disabilities and their families. Such ongoing needs may range from medical or behavioral services, supports for siblings and parents to childcare concerns.
- Continue to explore the development of resources that will help families to support their children with disabilities in their homes.

Section V: Non-Community Based Residential Placements

Overview

This section provides an analysis of the number of placements in Non-Community Based Residential Programs. This includes a Statewide summary and analysis by each of the placing/funding Agencies represented in this category. Non-Community-Based Residential Programs (NCB) include the following placements: Residential Treatment Centers (RTCs); Adult Corrections; Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers; Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs; Residential Educational Facilities; Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program; and Non-Secure/Non-RTC.

Definitions

- “*Detention and Commitment Centers*” - Detention Centers are secure facilities for pre-treatment of children pending placement. Commitment Centers are secure treatment facilities for children with a broad range of emotional, behavioral, and other needs.
- “*Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program*” - Short-term care not to exceed ninety (90) days in length that identifies and facilitates diagnostic services for children in need of stabilization before transition into a longer-term placement setting.
- “*Living Arrangement-Non-Community Based*” - Includes juvenile commitment facilities, the adult criminal correctional system and residential juvenile detention and juvenile detention programs.
- “*Non-Secure/Non-RTC*” - These are placements for children whose profile indicates no need for either a secure facility or the intensive psychiatric care provided by an RTC. These facilities are for children with low- to medium- risk security profiles.
- “*Residential Educational Facilities*” - An organized non-public education program of instruction in English language arts, mathematics, science, social studies and other curricular areas provided by a teacher to students enrolled in grades K-12.
- “*Residential Treatment Centers (RTC)*” - An RTC refers to a specialized type of facility that offers intensive psychiatric care. RTC facilities must be licensed by the DHMH Office of Health Care Quality and accredited by the Joint Commission. There is a specified set of psychiatrists, psychiatric nurses, and other mental health professionals required to be on staff to meet the RTC licensing requirements as well as a set of quality of care standards for RTC operation.
- “*Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs*”
 - “*ASAM Level III.1 (Halfway House)*” - Clinically-Managed Low-Intensity Residential Treatment
 - “*ASAM Level III.3 (Long-Term Care)*” - Clinically-Managed Medium-Intensity Residential Treatment
 - “*ASAM Level III.5 (Therapeutic Community)*” - Clinically-Managed High-Intensity Residential Treatment
 - “*ASAM Level III.7 (Intermediate Care Facility)*” - Medically-Monitored Intensive Inpatient Treatment
 - “*ASAM Level III.7.D*” – Medically-Monitored Inpatient Detoxification

Non-Community Based Residential Placements Summary





Chart 113



All Agencies Non-Community Based Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	9	12	15	14	17.2%	-6.7%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	174	178	166	160	-2.7%	-3.6%
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	32	23	35	45	17.5%	28.6%
Residential Educational Facilities	52	59	44	58	6.6%	31.8%
Residential Treatment Centers	988	914	826	719	-10.0%	-13.0%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	365	400	438	429	5.7%	-2.1%
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	84	100	122	106	9.3%	-13.1%
Total	1,704	1,686	1,646	1,531	-3.5%	-7.0%

Chart 114

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)


Approximately 4% of all DHR placements are Non-Community Based Placements. These placements are designed for children and youth with the most intensive needs (such as severe mental health disorders) or those youth who are incarcerated (either in the adult or juvenile criminal justice system). These placements are not funded by DHR.

DHR children/youth may be placed in three categories of Non-Community Based Placements:

- Residential Treatment Centers;
- Secure Detention Facilities – through a juvenile court commitment; or
- Correctional Institution – through an adult criminal court order.


Both Secure Detention Facility and Correctional Institution Placements fall into the MD CHESSIE data-entry category of “living arrangement.” Depending on the youth’s age and the criminal charge, the youth may be involved in either the juvenile or adult criminal justice systems, with the placement dependent on that court’s order.

Population Totals



DHR Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2012	
Subcategory	Placements
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0
Residential Educational Facilities	0
Residential Treatment Centers	193
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	106


Chart 115



DHR Non-Community Based Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Educational Facilities	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	251	239	184	193	-7.6%	4.9%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	84	100	122	106	9.3%	-13.1%
Total	335	339	306	299	-3.6%	-2.3%

Chart 116


As Community-Based initiatives, including Care Management Entities (CMEs), have been implemented Statewide, the need for RTC placements for children in DHR out-of-home care has generally decreased, although there was a slight increase this year. The number of youth placed in criminal justice-related placements, however, increased through 2011, but decreased in 2012. RTC placements remain the majority of DHR's Non-Community Based placements (Chart 117).



DHR Non-Community Based Placement % Trends				
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012
Residential Treatment Centers	74.9%	70.5%	60.1%	64.5%
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	25.1%	29.5%	39.9%	35.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chart 117


Population Demographics



DHR Non-Community Based Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	30	17	21	27	2.9%	28.6%
12 through 17	255	250	193	192	-8.4%	-0.5%
18 and over	50	72	92	80	19.6%	-13.0%
Total	335	339	306	299	-3.6%	-2.3%

Chart 118


As would be expected, no child under the age of 6 is placed in a Non-Community-Based Placement. Children aged 6 to 11 are primarily in RTC placements, not juvenile court-related placements. The majority of youth in Non-Community-Based Placements are aged 12 to 17.



DHR Non-Community Based Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	206	204	204	188	-2.9%	-7.8%
Female	129	135	102	111	-3.7%	8.8%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	335	339	306	299	-3.6%	-2.3%

Chart 119

Slightly less than two-thirds of the youth in Non-Community-Based Placements are male. The number of males in these placements did not change significantly between 2009 and 2011, although there was a nearly 8% decrease in 2012. At the same time, there was an increase in the number of females in this placement category in 2012. The decrease from 2009 among females was slightly larger than for males (14% females, 9% males).




DHR Non-Community Based Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	2	0	1	0	NA	-100.0%
Asian	1	1	0	0	NA	NA
Black or African-American	216	217	213	200	-2.5%	-6.1%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	94	107	74	81	-2.5%	9.5%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	20	13	10	14	-6.0%	40.0%
Other	2	0	6	3	NA	-50.0%
Unknown	0	1	2	1	NA	-50.0%
Total	335	339	306	299	-3.6%	-2.3%

Chart 120

The racial breakdown of youth in Non-Community-Based Placements remains similar to that of the overall DHR population, with approximately 67% Black or African-American, and 27% White. The decrease from 2009 among Whites was larger than among Black or African-Americans (14% White; 7% Africa-American).

Out-of-State Demographics



DHR Out of State Non-Community Based Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Educational Facilities	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	0	0	1	3	NA	200.0%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	0	0	1	3	NA	200.0%

Chart 121

Very few children in DHR out-of-home care require an out-of-State Non-Community-Based Placement; those who do have been placed in RTCs.

Placement Costs

DHR does not fund Non-Community-Based Placements. RTC placements are funded by Medicaid and criminal justice-related placements are funded by the appropriate system, juvenile or adult.


Conclusion

Over the past four years, the proportion of DHR children/youth in Non-Community-Based Placements has remained nearly the same at 4%, despite overall (and significant) decreases in the total DHR out-of-home population. These children and youth require intensive services and supports, including case management, placement resources, family supports, mental health treatment, and delinquency prevention programs.

Non-Community-Based Placements are primarily driven by mental health needs and delinquency issues that can affect any child. Accordingly, there is a continued need for intensive services and placements Statewide, specifically in the area of delinquency prevention and alternatives to RTC placement.

DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS)

Population Totals




DJS Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2012	
Subcategory	Placements
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	14
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	167
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	38
Residential Educational Facilities	0
Residential Treatment Centers	155
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	249
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	0

Chart 122

DJS Non-Community-Based Programs include State-run committed programs and a variety of privately-run programs, both in- and out-of-State. Of the total 957 out-of-home residential population, 623 or 65% are placed in programs in this subcategory. These programs generally offer on-site education services, and may be secured by 24-hour staff supervision, or by locked doors and perimeter fences.

Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment programs provide short-term in-patient diagnostic services. Juvenile Commitment Centers include only DJS-run programs, including three youth centers and the secure programs at Victor Cullen Center and Carter Center. Non-Secure/Non-RTC out-of-State programs includes a handful of specialized programs providing sex-offender, fire-setter and other treatment services. Residential Treatment Centers (RTCs) are licensed by DHMH and provide intensive mental health treatment services. Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM) include private in-patient substance abuse programs, as well as the state-run William Donald Schaefer House and Meadow Mountain Youth Center programs. For this Report, this category also includes the Silver Oak Academy program.




DJS Non-Community Based Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	9	12	15	14	17.2%	-6.7%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	178	180	178	167	-2.1%	-6.2%
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	28	21	23	38	16.6%	65.2%
Residential Educational Facilities	1	1	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	156	156	180	155	0.5%	-13.9%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	184	192	234	249	10.9%	6.4%
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	556	562	630	623	4.0%	-1.1%

Chart 123

The census figures show a marked increase in the youth population served at diagnostic evaluation treatment programs, which had an average change of 17.2% in four years, though the numbers served are relatively low, so this apparent change may not be significant.

The fluctuation in the one-day census figures for the population at Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers is misleading: these programs normally operate at full capacity, but there were some transitions and temporary closures of programs in 2012 (notably, the temporary reduction of a unit at the Savage Mountain Youth Center, and the transition of the girls committed program from the Waxter to the Carter facilities.)




DJS Non-Community Based Placement % Trends				
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	1.6%	2.1%	2.4%	2.2%
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	32.0%	32.0%	28.3%	26.8%
Residential Educational Facilities	5.0%	3.7%	3.7%	6.1%
Residential Treatment Centers	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	28.1%	27.8%	28.6%	24.9%
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	33.1%	34.2%	37.1%	40.0%
Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Chart 124

The rise in the number of youth served by Non-Secure/Non-RTC Programs reflects a general rise in the number of DJS committed youth placed out-of-State over the past few years. Similarly, there has been a rise in the number of youth served in RTC programs over the past few years. This may in part be due to some streamlining of the referral and approval process for RTC placement undertaken in recent years.


The population of youth served at Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs has risen in the census data. This is primarily due to the inclusion of the new Silver Oak Academy program, which is categorized here as an ASAM, and made 48 new beds available in FY2011.

Population Demographics




DJS Non-Community Based Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	1	1	1	NA	0.0%
12 through 17	442	428	466	488	3.5%	4.7%
18 and over	114	133	163	134	7.1%	-17.8%
Total	556	562	630	623	4.0%	-1.1%

Chart 125



DJS Non-Community Based Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	502	506	575	565	4.2%	-1.7%
Female	54	56	55	58	2.5%	5.5%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	556	562	630	623	4.0%	-1.1%

Chart 126




DJS Non-Community Based Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	1	1	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	2	1	3	0	16.7%	-100.0%
Black or African-American	383	398	456	450	5.7%	-1.3%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	154	132	143	151	-0.1%	5.6%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	14	25	24	22	22.1%	-8.3%
Unknown	2	5	4	0	10.0%	-100.0%
Total	556	562	630	623	4.0%	-1.1%

Chart 127

The demographic makeup of DJS youth in out-of-home placements changed little in the annual one-day census counts shown in the charts above. Apparent increases in the proportion of female and African-American youth are not borne out in the full annual data that has been compiled for the DJS Data Resource Guide FY12.

The “Unknown” category includes youth whose race is not known or was not recorded into the DJS ASSIST case record management system.


Out-of-State Demographics



DJS Out of State Non-Community Based Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	1	2	5	0	50.0%	-100.0%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	28	19	28	38	17.0%	35.7%
Residential Educational Facilities	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	32	21	23	18	-15.5%	-21.7%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	51	53	68	76	14.7%	11.8%
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	112	95	124	132	7.3%	6.5%

Chart 128


The number of youth placed out-of-State has risen somewhat over the past four years, and has plateaued at around 130 youth. This stems primarily from the lack of secure programs in Maryland for DJS committed youth, and an increased emphasis on assessing youth risk, and insuring appropriate placement the first time, rather than chancing placement in community-based, less-secure programs. Though many programs are categorized here as Non-Secure or Substance Abuse Programs, many youth are placed in these programs who present high public safety risk. These programs handle such youth, even though they may lack high security architecture, as they are in remote locations and offer low flight risk.



DJS Out of State Non-Community Based Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
12 through 17	78	59	79	88	7.0%	11.4%
18 and over	34	36	45	44	9.6%	-2.2%
Total	112	95	124	132	7.3%	6.5%

Chart 129


Despite fluctuations in the one-day census figures in the above chart, there have been little significant changes in the age makeup of youth placed out-of-State.



DJS Out of State Non-Community Based Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	107	89	123	130	9.0%	5.7%
Female	5	6	1	2	12.2%	100.0%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	112	95	124	132	7.3%	6.5%

Chart 130

There are only a handful of female youth placed out-of-State by DJS. These youth are sent out-of-State primarily to get specialized treatment not available in-State. The overwhelming majority of DJS youth placed out-of-State are male.




DJS Out of State Non-Community Based Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	1	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	2	0	1	0	NA	-100.0%
Black or African-American	92	78	104	119	10.8%	14.4%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	17	12	12	8	-20.9%	-33.3%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	1	4	6	5	111.1%	-16.7%
Unknown	0	0	1	0	NA	-100.0%
Total	112	95	124	132	7.3%	6.5%

Chart 131

Despite fluctuations in the one-day census figures in the above chart, there have been little significant changes in the racial makeup of youth placed out-of-State. Full annual data on out-of-State placements is available in the DJS Data Resource Guide 2012.


Placement Costs



DJS Non-Community Based Total Cost Trends

Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	\$29,577	\$41,686	\$48,723	\$539,495	355.0%	1007.3%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	\$25,931,331	\$24,558,717	\$25,367,344	\$27,630,982	2.3%	8.9%
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	\$2,821,455	\$2,627,642	\$3,197,330	\$7,787,834	52.8%	143.6%
Residential Treatment Centers	\$10,329,968	\$9,249,665	\$8,965,749	\$9,344,674	-3.1%	4.2%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	\$3,305,171	\$2,707,437	\$4,227,943	\$14,172,257	91.1%	235.2%
Total	\$42,417,502	\$39,185,147	\$41,807,089	\$59,475,242	13.8%	42.3%


Chart 132



DJS Out of State Non-Community Based Total Cost Trends

Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$233,070	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	\$2,821,455	\$2,627,642	\$3,197,330	\$5,062,804	24.4%	58.3%
Residential Treatment Centers	\$3,358,402	\$2,407,182	\$1,545,483	\$2,115,372	-9.1%	36.9%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	\$109,267	\$202,860	\$1,918,509	\$5,748,018	377.0%	199.6%
Total	\$6,289,124	\$5,237,684	\$6,661,322	\$13,159,264	36.0%	97.5%


Chart 133



DJS Non-Community Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends

Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	\$2,112	\$1,157	\$854	\$237	-47.9%	-72.2%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	\$334	\$357	\$311	\$347	1.9%	11.6%
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	\$349	\$360	\$389	\$469	10.6%	20.6%
Residential Treatment Centers	\$524	\$551	\$708	\$562	4.3%	-20.6%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	\$228	\$229	\$245	\$215	-1.6%	-12.2%
Total	\$354	\$374	\$349	\$329	-2.3%	-5.7%

Chart 134



DJS Out of State Non-Community Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends

Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$280	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	\$349	\$360	\$389	\$390	3.8%	0.3%
Residential Treatment Centers	\$337	\$352	\$409	\$382	4.7%	-6.6%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	\$172	\$173	\$257	\$231	13.0%	-10.1%
Total	\$337	\$342	\$342	\$298	-3.8%	-12.9%

Chart 135

A note on DJS expenditure data: Program billing data often comes from payments to programs that operate units across more than one category of service. Thus, an invoice may, for example, cover a payment for bed days of youth in Substance Abuse, Group Home, and Independent Living programs. It is not possible at this time to dis-aggregate the cost information accurately between program units, so expenditures at the individual program type level will not show accurate or meaningful trends. DJS, however, intends to publish actual per-diem cost for all program types as part of the Data Resource Guide 2012. This will be a more accurate and meaningful cost summary for out-of-home placements.

Conclusion

Gaps and Needs

The primary need is for in-State capacity to serve higher-risk DJS youth requiring committed out-of-home Non-Community-Based Placement. Since the closure of Hickey committed programs in 2005, the number of committed children waiting in detention for placement increased, as did the number of youth being served out-of-State. Both populations remain as issues of concern. DJS' Comprehensive capital plan includes two in-State facilities that would help fill the need, and would reduce both pending placement and out-of-State placements. But neither is slated to be finished for at least three years. In the meantime, DJS continues to seek greater capacity in-State. DJS reopened the Victor Cullen Center in FY2009, and contracted with Rite of Passage, Inc. to open the Silver Oak Academy as a new program in Maryland to serve higher risk youth. Still, additional in-State capacity is needed for higher risk youth.

In Winter 2011/2012, DJS moved the female hardware secure program from the Waxter facility in Anne Arundel County to the Carter Facility on the Eastern Shore. This program continues to provide the only secure committed programming in Maryland for young women committed to DJS.

Highlights


- DJS lacks adequate capacity to serve high risk youth in-State.
- Over the past four years, the number of youth served out-of-State has increased, as DJS has better assessed youth for risk, and worked to insure appropriate placement for higher risk youth.
- Youth placed out-of-State are overwhelmingly male.
- A significant portion of DJS youth that are placed out-of-home are committed to mental health and substance abuse programs.
- The average age at the time of placement is 17.0 for Non-Community-Based youth.

Recommendations

- Increase the in-State capacity to treat higher risk DJS committed youth.
- Expand the use of MCASP Risk Assessment tool to place youth in appropriate programs based on service and treatment needs.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE ALCOHOL AND DRUG AND ABUSE ADMINISTRATION (ADAA)

Population Totals



ADAA Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2012	
Subcategory	Placements
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0
Residential Educational Facilities	0
Residential Treatment Centers	0
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	180
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	0

Chart 136

In Maryland, State-funded substance abuse treatment is delivered through a network of services defined through the standards set by the American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM) Patient Placement Criteria. These standards ensure increased uniformity of treatment and cost-effective allocation of resources.


The residential ASAM levels of care to which children/youth are admitted include:

Level III.1 – Clinically-Managed Low-Intensity Residential – outpatient or intensive outpatient treatment services in a residential setting such as a halfway house. 10 placements were active at this level on January 31, 2012, which is available only to patients aged 18 and older.

Level III.3 – Clinically-Managed Medium-Intensity Residential – programs provide a structured recovery environment in combination with clinical services, such as a therapeutic rehabilitation facility offering long-term care. 23 placements were active at this level.

Level III.5 – Clinically-Managed High-Intensity Residential – a structured therapeutic community providing a recovery environment in combination with intense clinical services. 21 placements were active at this level.

Level III.7 – Medically-Monitored Intensive Inpatient Treatment – programs offer a planned regimen of 24-hour professionally-directed evaluation, care and treatment for addicted patients in an inpatient setting. Services may include detoxification (**Level III.7.D**). Level III.7 care is delivered by an interdisciplinary staff to patients whose sub-acute biomedical and emotional/behavioral problems are sufficiently severe to require inpatient care. 115 patients were placed active in Level III.7, which has an average length of stay less than a month and a high turnover rate. Eleven placements were active in detoxification.



ADAA Non-Community Based Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Educational Facilities	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	181	208	204	180	0.4%	-11.8%
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	181	208	204	180	0.4%	-11.8%

Chart 137


The change in placements in FY2012 were largely in Level III.1 (-54.5%) and Level III.5 (-53.3%). There was an increase, however, in placements in Level III.3 (+228.6%) over FY2011.

Population Flow

ADAA Placement Population Flow - All Placements (count of placements, not children)					
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Total Served	Ends in FY (Placement Exits)	Placements at End of FY
2010	199	2,378	2,577	2,376	201
2011	201	2,283	2,484	2,247	237
2012	187	2,183	2,370	2,171	199
Two-Year Change	-6.0%	-8.2%	-8.0%	-8.6%	-1.0%
Average Yearly Change	-3.0%	-4.1%	-4.0%	-4.3%	-0.5%
Recent Year Change	-7.0%	-4.4%	-4.6%	-3.4%	-16.0%

Chart 138


The decreased number of placements served reflects longer lengths of stay in residential treatment. For patients disenrolled in FY2012, the average length of treatment in Level III.5 was 17 days greater than in FY2011(123 days compared to 106) and in Level III.3 the average length of stay increased by 23 days (75 days compared to 52).



ADAA Total Served						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Non-Community Based	2,275	2,577	2,484	2,370	1.7%	-4.6%
Total	2,275	2,577	2,484	2,370	1.7%	-4.6%


Chart 139

Population Demographics




ADAA Non-Community Based Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
12 through 17	87	83	85	89	0.8%	4.7%
18 and over	94	125	119	91	1.5%	-23.5%
Total	181	208	204	180	0.4%	-11.8%

Chart 140



ADAA Non-Community Based Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	144	154	153	129	-3.1%	-15.7%
Female	37	54	51	51	13.5%	0.0%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	181	208	204	180	0.4%	-11.8%

Chart 141



ADAA Non-Community Based Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	1	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	1	2	1	1	16.7%	0.0%
Black or African-American	65	53	65	45	-8.9%	-30.8%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	111	146	133	127	6.0%	-4.5%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	1	1	NA	0.0%
Other	4	6	4	6	22.2%	50.0%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	181	208	204	180	0.4%	-11.8%

Chart 142

The percentage of children/youth in placement who were White increased from FY2009 to FY2012 and the percentage of children/youth aged 17 and younger also increased. The proportion of females increased from 20% to 28% since 2009. Admissions to Level III.5 under age 21 in FY2012 were predominantly under age 18 while those to Levels III.1 and 3 were exclusively aged 18 to 20. Approximately 50 % of Level III.7 admissions and 12% of III.7.D admissions were under age 18, showing a high degree of variance in age distribution. The predominance of males in this population is similar to that found in outpatient treatment, overall. On the other hand, 48% of outpatient admissions were Black or African-American, compared to about one-quarter of the residential placements.


Placement by Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from Jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																									
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	6	3.3%	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	19	10.6%	2	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	23	12.8%	5	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	27	15.0%	2	1	15	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	6	3.3%	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	3	1.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	7	3.9%	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	8	4.4%	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	6	3.3%	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	3	1.7%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	8	4.4%	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	8	4.4%	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	6	3.3%	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	5	2.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	10	5.6%	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	3	1.7%	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	5	2.8%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	2	1.1%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	2	1.1%	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	6	3.3%	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	4	2.2%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	13	7.2%	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	180	100.0%	43	10	71	8	1	0	0	0	3	25	0	0	2	6	7	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0
% of children from jurisdiction			50.0%	26.3%	65.2%	29.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all			23.9%	5.6%	39.4%	4.4%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	13.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	3.3%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Chart 143


As noted above, for the most part placements are made on a regional or Statewide basis according to the individual needs of the patient. Particular residential levels of care are not available in every jurisdiction.

Placement Costs



ADAA Non-Community Based Total Cost Trends						
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	\$5,824,947	\$5,479,180	\$5,412,365	\$4,662,413	-7.0%	-13.9%
Total	\$5,824,947	\$5,479,180	\$5,412,365	\$4,662,413	-7.0%	-13.9%

Chart 144



ADAA Non-Community Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends						
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	\$106	\$84	\$86	\$70	-12.3%	-18.6%
Total	\$106	\$84	\$86	\$70	-12.3%	-18.6%

Chart 145

These bed-day costs are expected to fluctuate given the relatively small portion of the population pool represented by these placements.


Conclusion

Prescription drugs, primarily opiate painkillers and benzodiazepines, remain the fastest-growing category of substances abused among children/youth. Prescription-opiates, primarily Oxycodone, went from affecting 24% of the placements in FY2009 to 41% in FY2012, overtaking alcohol in its impact on this population. Benzodiazepines increased from 5% to 10% during that period. Children/youth admitted to treatment with prescription-drug problems were primarily White. The most prevalent substance of abuse remains marijuana, affecting 76% of the children/youth placed in FY2012.

Approximately one-third of the population had problems with both alcohol and marijuana. Heroin problems increased from 21% to 27% since 2009, and the majority of under-21 placements (75%) had problems with more than one substance, with 41% having three substances listed. Patients in this age group admitted with heroin problems primarily inject the drug and are predominantly White.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE MENTAL HYGIENE ADMINISTRATION (MHA)


Population Totals



MHA Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2012	
Subcategory	Placements
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0
Residential Educational Facilities	0
Residential Treatment Centers	371
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	0

Chart 146

All MHA placements are funded through medical assistance (a State and federal Medicaid dollar match). “Residential Treatment Centers” is the only placement subcategory used by MHA since it is the only Non-Community-Based Placement that is funded by Medical Assistance. To ensure clarity in discussions of MHA data, a residential treatment center may be referred to as an “RTC,” or as a “psychiatric residential treatment facility” (PRTF), using federal government nomenclature. Medical Assistance is often referred to simply as “MA,” or as “Medicaid,” again using federal government nomenclature. RTCs provide treatment to children/youth with severe behavior problems and clinical needs that cannot be met in typical community placements.



MHA Non-Community Based Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Educational Facilities	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	534	482	440	371	-11.4%	-15.7%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	534	482	440	371	-11.4%	-15.7%

Chart 147

The yearly trend of one-day counts for the “Residential Treatment Centers” category shows decreases of about 11% in each of the last three years. This is the result of Maryland’s Community-Based alternative to RTCs put in place through the federal Medicaid “Section 1915(c) Home and Community-Based Services Waiver” (RTC Waiver).

The federal government has specifically encouraged development of alternatives to the standard residential treatment center or “Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facility (PRTF)” in order to promote treatment in the community. The federal government approved Maryland’s RTC Waiver proposal in FY2009. Maryland began enrolling children and youth into this community alternative in FY2010. The number of children and youth enrolled in the RTC Waiver was 60 in FY2010, 166 in FY2011, and 210 in FY2012.

All children who require an RTC level of care are eligible to be considered for RTC Waiver treatment in the community, up to the number of individuals specified in the Waiver, as long as it has been determined that they can be safely treated in the community with an appropriate plan of care (POC) and the provision of community-based services individualized to the needs of the child.


The length of stay in the RTC level of care has declined over the past three years, which has also contributed to the decrease in the number of children in RTCs. This has been due in large part to

an MHA effort to have children move from the RTCs to community treatment as soon as their clinical needs can safely be met at a lower level of care. MHA has accomplished this through both a process of monitoring their progress in the RTC and providing technical assistance in discharge planning.

Population Flow

MHA Placement Population Flow - All Placements (count of placements, not children)					
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Total Served	Ends in FY (Placement Exits)	Placements at End of FY
2010	517	1049	1566	648	918
2011	435	489	924	430	494
2012	435	415	850	521	329
Two-Year Change	-15.9%	-60.4%	-45.7%	-19.6%	-64.2%
Average Yearly Change	-7.9%	-30.2%	-22.9%	-9.8%	-32.1%
Recent Year Change	0.0%	-15.1%	-8.0%	21.2%	-33.4%

Chart 148




MHA Total Served						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Family Home	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Community-Based	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Community Based	1603	1566	924	850	-17.1%	-8.0%
Hospitalization	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Not Available	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	1603	1566	924	850	-17.1%	-8.0%

Chart 149

As mentioned earlier, all MHA placements are funded through Medical Assistance and the RTC subcategory is the only placement category that is used by MHA because it is the only Non-Community-Based Placement that is funded by medical assistance.

Both the “Total Served” and the “Placements at End of FY” have declined over the past three years. As with the one-day counts, this is the result of Maryland’s Community-Based alternative to RTCs put in place through the federal Medicaid process known as a “Section 1915(c) Home and Community-Based Services Waiver.” Over the past three years, more and more Maryland children and youth have been served in community placements with wraparound services instead of RTCs.


Population Demographics



MHA Non-Community Based Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	1	NA	NA
6 through 11	53	32	50	49	4.9%	-2.0%
12 through 17	443	406	351	285	-13.6%	-18.8%
18 and over	38	44	39	36	-1.1%	-7.7%
Total	534	482	440	371	-11.4%	-15.7%

Chart 150


As noted earlier, all MHA Non-Community-Based Placements are in RTCs and overall MHA Non-Community Placement numbers have declined from year to year due to the movement of children and youth from RTCs into community treatment through the RTC Waiver. Most placements involve adolescents aged 12 to 17 because this is the age when the most serious behavior problems requiring residential treatment emerge. Percentage changes have been greater for the 12 to 17 age group because they represent the majority of individuals and the total numbers have declined over time.



MHA Non-Community Based Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	331	276	272	232	-10.9%	-14.7%
Female	203	205	168	139	-11.4%	-17.3%
Unknown	0	1	0	0	NA	NA
Total	534	482	440	371	-11.4%	-15.7%

Chart 151

The MHA Non-Community Based Gender Trends percentage changes are the result of the movement of Maryland children and youth from RTCs into community treatment through the RTC Waiver. Although males, who represent the majority of those in residential treatment centers, have a similar percentage decrease over time compared with females, a slightly higher proportion of the females have been enrolled in the RTC Waiver than males, resulting in slightly higher percentage changes.



MHA Non-Community Based Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	0	3	3	NA	0.0%
Asian	2	2	2	3	16.7%	50.0%
Black or African-American	287	263	225	177	-14.7%	-21.3%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	221	193	175	149	-12.3%	-14.9%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	23	24	19	24	3.3%	26.3%
Unknown	1	0	16	15	NA	-6.3%
Total	534	482	440	371	-11.4%	-15.7%

Chart 152

MHA Non-Community Based race numbers have declined over the past three years from movement of children and youth from RTCs into community treatment in the Maryland RTC Waiver. “Black or African-American” and “White” categories represent the great majority of children and youth in RTCs. “Black or African-American” children and youth are historically over-represented in these placements just as these children/youth are over-represented in juvenile justice and child welfare placements (“disproportionate minority contact”). The “Other” category represents the “Bi-Racial/Multiple Race” category, which is increasing. The “Unknown” category represents a small number of cases in which race was not specified.

Placement by Jurisdiction


Home Jurisdiction of Children	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	6	1.6%	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	23	6.2%	0	11	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	123	33.2%	0	0	8	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	55	14.8%	0	1	3	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	1	0.3%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	1	0.3%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	10	2.7%	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	9	2.4%	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	44	11.9%	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	9	2.4%	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Howard	9	2.4%	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	46	12.4%	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Prince George's	8	2.2%	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	2	0.5%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	5	1.3%	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	1	0.3%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	4	1.1%	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	6	1.6%	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	2	0.5%	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	4	1.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	371	100.0%	0	22	17	220	0	0	0	0	0	13	48	0	0	0	0	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
% of children from jurisdiction			0.0%	47.8%	6.5%	80.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	77.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	73.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed			0.0%	5.9%	4.6%	59.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	12.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%

Chart 153

Although placement within (or near) a child or youth’s jurisdiction is one factor considered in placing a child in a RTC, the primary determinant is the child’s or youth’s treatment needs, since some types of treatment services are available in some RTCs and not in others (programming, ages and genders served are not identical across facilities), and whether or not a particular program has a vacancy at the time of referral or anticipates one within a reasonable time frame.

Furthermore, there are only 10 RTCs located in Maryland and these are not uniformly distributed throughout the State. Therefore, children and youth from most jurisdictions will necessarily be placed outside their jurisdiction. The in-State RTCs are located in Baltimore County (4), Baltimore City (2), Montgomery County (2), Dorchester County (1), and Frederick County (1). One RTC closed in FY2012 resulting in a small decrease in in-State RTC capacity.

Finally, each RTC, whether in-State or out-of-State, determines which child or youth will be admitted to the RTC and, in each of these RTCs, there are programming and vacancy constraints upon admissions.



MHA Out-of-State Non-Community Based Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Residential Treatment Centers	23	8	8	6	-30.1%	-25.0%
Total	23	8	8	6	-30.1%	-25.0%

Chart 154

For certain treatment needs and youth characteristics, there are no in-State residential treatment centers that provide for and will accept children and youth with those needs or characteristics. Examples include children and youth who require treatment for fire-setting or for sexually offensive behavior whose intellectual functioning falls below a certain level. In those cases, children and youth may necessarily be placed in an out-of-State residential treatment center. Very occasionally, a family may choose to place their child in an out-of-State RTC.

Nevertheless, efforts continue to find appropriate in-State residential treatment center beds for children and youth whose appropriate treatment requires that level of care. Progress has been made over the last three fiscal years in reducing the number of children and youth admitted both to in-State and to out-of-State RTCs. This has been accomplished through both serving more children and youth in the community with intensive services and a gradual development of

expanded treatment programming at in-State RTCs making out-of-State referrals less frequent. Currently, there are only a very small number of children and youth in out-of-State placements.

Placement Costs




Chart 155

As noted earlier, all MHA Non-Community-Based Placements are in RTCs. The figures in this chart represent the total Medical Assistance costs for all RTC placements. These costs vary by the number of children and youth who are placed, by the specific placements since the programs receive different reimbursement, and these program costs themselves also vary year to year. Just as the number of all children and youth in RTCs has significantly decreased over the past three fiscal years, the cost for the treatment of children and youth in the RTCs has also decreased over the past three fiscal years.




Chart 156

The primary reason for the significant decrease in MHA out-of-State Non-Community-Based total costs over the past three fiscal years is the significant decrease in the number of children and youth placed in out-of-State RTCs. The cost of out-of-State RTC care is often significantly higher than in-State RTC care because of the higher cost of those RTCs' special programming.




Chart 157




Chart 158

These figures represent the Medical Assistance costs for all children and youth placed by MHA in RTCs divided by the number of bed-days (the total number of days in RTC for all children and youth placed in RTCs). These bed-day costs can vary due to utilization of RTCs whose costs may be higher or lower than average due to different programming. RTC costs overall can vary year to year and have increased slightly over the past three years.

Conclusion

The current capacity of residential treatment centers in Maryland appears adequate to meet the needs of Maryland youth for this level of care for the foreseeable future, based on in-State RTC vacancy rates and MHA's plan to offer "RTC Waiver" services through a new "Section 1915(i) Home and Community-Based Services Waiver," a new and permanent alternative to providing RTC-level services in institutional settings. A 1915(i) Medicaid waiver would allow MHA to expand the number of youth served in the community with community-based services. Now, while it would be desirable to have the in-State RTCs offer more specialized treatment programs, such as treatment for fire-setting and sexually offensive behavior, especially for youth with low intellectual functioning, there may not be enough in-State referrals and financial incentive for in-State RTCs to develop such programming.


MHA's efforts to minimize the number of children and youth in out-of-State placements have been successful and will continue. At the present time, however, it appears likely that for a very small number of children and youth with needs for specialized treatment or who are in especially complicated circumstances, an out-of-State placement will continue to be necessary.

Over the past three years, significant numbers of children and youth have been able to move from institutional placements in RTCs into community treatment through the RTC Waiver initiative. Maryland's RTC Waiver is a federal Medicaid "Section 1915(c) Home and Community-Based Services Waiver" promoted by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services for this very purpose.

MHA will continue to develop the proposal to extend the Maryland "RTC Waiver" indefinitely through a "Section 1915(i) Home and Community-Based Services Waiver," a new, permanent Medicaid alternative to providing long-term services in institutional settings. MHA plans to continue to expand the availability of these community-based treatment placements to Maryland youth.

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (MSDE)


Population Totals



MSDE Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2012	
Subcategory	Placements
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0
Residential Educational Facilities	58
Residential Treatment Centers	0
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	0


Chart 159

The location for the delivery of special education and related services for children in residential placements is determined through the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team process. These students require a residential setting in order to implement the IEP. Local School Systems (LSSs) are required to provide a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) for all students who require special education and related services. The IEP team is charged with ensuring that the child is demonstrating educational progress in the approved placement. The IEP team, including the parent, may determine at any time that a change in placement is necessary to implement the IEP and to provide FAPE.



MSDE Non-Community Based Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Educational Facilities	51	58	44	58	7.1%	31.8%
Residential Treatment Centers	47	37	22	0	-53.9%	-100.0%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	98	95	66	58	-15.2%	-12.1%

Chart 160




MSDE Non-Community Based Placement Trends				
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012
Residential Educational Facilities	52.0%	61.1%	66.7%	100.0%
Residential Treatment Centers	48.0%	38.9%	33.3%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chart 161

Population Flow

MSDE Placement Population Flow - All Placements (count of placements, not children)					
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Total Served	Ends in FY (Placement Exits)	Placements at End of FY
2010	68	28	96	26	70
2011	49	20	69	11	58
2012	34	36	70	9	61
Two-Year Change	-50.0%	28.6%	-27.1%	-65.4%	-12.9%
Average Yearly Change	-25.0%	14.3%	-13.5%	-32.7%	-6.4%
Recent Year Change	-30.6%	80.0%	1.4%	-18.2%	5.2%

Chart 162




MSDE Total Served						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Family Home	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Community-Based	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Community Based	112	96	69	70	-13.7%	1.4%
Hospitalization	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Not Available	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	112	96	69	70	-13.7%	1.4%

Chart 163


The LSSs have a minimal number of students in residential placements. The LSSs are bound by federal law, the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA), to implement the IEP in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) where special education and related services can be provided to ensure FAPE. In some cases, this requires a residential setting. A student is placed in a residential setting by an LSS only when it is necessary to implement the IEP.

Population Demographics




MSDE Non-Community Based Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	3	4	4	2	-5.6%	-50.0%
12 through 17	36	33	23	28	-5.6%	21.7%
18 and over	59	58	39	28	-20.9%	-28.2%
Total	98	95	66	58	-15.2%	-12.1%

Chart 164



MSDE Non-Community Based Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	77	72	48	41	-18.1%	-14.6%
Female	21	23	18	17	-5.9%	-5.6%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	98	95	66	58	-15.2%	-12.1%

Chart 165



MSDE Non-Community Based Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	3	3	2	5	38.9%	150.0%
Black or African-American	25	27	15	13	-16.6%	-13.3%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	2	2	NA	0.0%
White	67	61	47	37	-17.7%	-21.3%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	1	NA	NA
Other	3	4	0	0	NA	NA
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	98	95	66	58	-15.2%	-12.1%

Chart 166

The population demographics for students with educational disabilities in residential placements related to gender are reflective of demographics for students with educational disabilities in community-based settings. The Maryland Special Education/Early Intervention Services Census Data and Related Tables (October 28, 2011) reports that 68% of all Maryland students who receive special education services are males while 31% are females. Often, students with disabilities in residential school programs are teenagers. Providing educational services for students with severe needs may become increasingly challenging as the child gets older and community-based services have been exhausted. Older students with needs, at this intensive level, frequently remain in residential schools until they transition to adult services.

Placement by Jurisdiction

Home Jurisdiction of Children	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	1	1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Anne Arundel	2	3.4%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Baltimore	6	10.3%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Baltimore City	5	8.6%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	2	3.4%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Carroll	1	1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	1	1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	1	1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	4	6.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	3	5.2%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	1	1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	2	3.4%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	20	34.5%	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
Prince George's	9	15.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	58	100.0%	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	6	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0
% of children from jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.0%	0.0%	10.3%	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	17.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	34.5%	0.0%

Chart 167

The “Placement by Jurisdictions” chart reflects the location of programs for students who require a residential educational school. Caroline, Cecil, Frederick, Howard, and Montgomery Counties each have designated at least one provider that has a residential school component for children who require residential special education and related services to implement an IEP. The students served have been identified with the primary disability of autism. The data indicate that the children who require a residential educational school setting are 12 to 21 years of age. More than 50% of children requiring a residential educational setting are over the age of 18. The LSSs are required to provide special education and related services through the school year in which the child turns 21. These services include transition planning and coordination to appropriate adult services.




Chart 168






Chart 169



MSDE Out-of-State Non-Community Based Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	37	31	15	12	-29.3%	-20.0%
Female	10	6	7	8	-3.0%	14.3%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	47	37	22	20	-23.6%	-9.1%

Chart 170




MSDE Out-of-State Non-Community Based Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Black or African-American	12	10	8	7	-16.4%	-12.5%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	34	25	14	13	-25.9%	-7.1%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	1	2	0	0	NA	NA
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	47	37	22	20	-23.6%	-9.1%

Chart 171

Occasionally, the physical location for the delivery of special education and related services for children who require a residential educational setting to implement the IEP is in an out-of-State program. Approximately one-third of the children in residential settings are out-of-State. The IEP team must consider the proximity to the child’s home. In some cases, the out-of-State program is closer to the child’s home than an in-State program. For the remaining out-of-State placements, the major factor is that there is not an available in-State placement to provide FAPE in the LRE. Many of the children who require a residential setting for educational purposes require more than one year of such programming. They often remain in the residential educational setting until the end of the year in which they turn 21 years of age.


MSDE has been working diligently to engage in partnerships with providers to enhance the options for in-State programming. MSDE has partnered with the University of Maryland’s Center for Mental Health to provide school-based mental health counseling in Baltimore City and Prince George’s County Public Schools. This has decreased the number of children requiring day placements outside their community schools. MSDE also partners for mental health services in Harford County Public Schools with Upper Bay Counseling. MSDE partners with a number of nonpublic special education schools to provide special education and related services in the public school setting rather than transporting the children to separate buildings.

Placement Costs



MSDE Non-Community Based Total Cost Trends						
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Residential Educational Facilities	\$15,161,831	\$13,918,875	\$12,672,874	\$11,690,683	143.4%	524.9%
Total	\$15,161,831	\$13,918,875	\$12,672,874	\$11,690,683	143.4%	524.9%

Chart 172



MSDE Out-of-State Non-Community Based Total Cost Trends						
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Residential Educational Facilities	\$7,989,636	\$6,186,993	\$4,933,768	\$5,122,421	27.2%	173.8%
Total	\$7,989,636	\$6,186,993	\$4,933,768	\$5,122,421	27.2%	173.8%

Chart 173

One of the greatest service challenges in Maryland is providing services for children with autism complicated by severe behavioral needs and other related disabilities. These children often require intensive and long-term programming. Due to the intense level of support in residential programming, these children do not generally return to a public school setting before they age out of the school system. MSDE continues to work with a number of in-State residential providers to expand their programs.

Section VI: Hospitalizations

Overview

This section provides an analysis of the number of placements in Hospitalizations. This includes a Statewide summary and analysis by each of the placing/funding Agencies represented in this category. Hospitalizations include the following placements: General Hospitalization and Psychiatric Hospitalization. Hospitalization placements were reported by DHR and DJS only.

Definitions

- “General Hospitalization” - Hospitalization for a medical (non-psychiatric) illness or injury.
- “Psychiatric Hospitalization” - Hospitalization for a mental health disorder/emergency.

Hospitalizations Summary





Chart 174




All Agencies Hospitalization Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
In-Patient Private	7	6	16	5	27.9%	-68.8%
Psychiatric Hospitalization	22	25	27	13	-10.1%	-51.9%
Total	29	31	43	18	-4.2%	-58.1%

Chart 175

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)


Less than 1% of all DHR placements include children/youth in hospital placements, including both Medical and Psychiatric Hospitalizations. Over the past four years, one-day count data indicates that more DHR children are in Psychiatric than Medical (general) Hospitalizations.

Population Totals




DHR Placements by Subcategory, 1/31/2012	
Subcategory	Placements
In-Patient Private	5
Psychiatric Hospitalization	6

Chart 176



DHR Hospitalization Placement Trends						
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
In-Patient Private	7	6	16	5	27.9%	-68.8%
Psychiatric Hospitalization	14	17	22	6	-7.3%	-72.7%
Total	21	23	38	11	1.2%	-71.1%


Chart 177



DHR Hospitalization Placement % Trends				
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012
In-Patient Private	33.3%	26.1%	42.1%	45.5%
Psychiatric Hospitalization	66.7%	73.9%	57.9%	54.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chart 178


Population Demographics



DHR Hospitalization Age Trends						
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	2	3	4	5	36.1%	25.0%
6 through 11	2	0	5	1	NA	-80.0%
12 through 17	15	16	24	4	-8.9%	-83.3%
18 and over	2	4	5	1	15.0%	-80.0%
Total	21	23	38	11	1.2%	-71.1%


Chart 179

Although for the one-day counts in FY2009 through FY2011, the age group of 12 to 17 represented a majority of the DHR children in Hospitalizations, this trend did not carry into FY2012. Due to the extremely small numbers in this placement category, caution must be taken when interpreting this data.



DHR Hospitalization Gender Trends						
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	8	8	23	7	39.3%	-69.6%
Female	13	15	15	4	-19.3%	-73.3%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	21	23	38	11	1.2%	-71.1%

Chart 180



DHR Hospitalization Race Trends						
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	1	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Black or African-American	10	12	15	5	-7.2%	-66.7%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	1	0	0	NA	NA
White	8	7	15	5	11.7%	-66.7%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	2	1	7	1	154.8%	-85.7%
Other	1	1	0	0	NA	NA
Unknown	0	0	1	0	NA	-100.0%
Total	21	23	38	11	1.2%	-71.1%

Chart 181

Although females had constituted a majority of Hospitalizations in FY2009 and FY2010, males were more predominant in FY2011 and FY2012. And, although Black or African-Americans made up higher proportions in FY2009 and FY2011 than Whites, both groups included equal proportions in FY2011 and FY2012. Again, caution must be taken when interpreting this data.

Out-of-State Demographics

DHR does not place any children in Hospitalization out-of-State.

Placement Costs

DHR does not fund Hospitalization placements. They are funded by Medicaid for children in DHR out-of-home care.

Conclusion

There will always be a need for Medical and Psychiatric Hospitalizations for children in Maryland, including those in DHR out-of-home care. Over the past four years, one-day count data indicates that more DHR children are in Psychiatric than Medical Hospitalizations. Early intervention for and recognition of mental health disorders may prevent some Hospitalizations.

Section VII: Maryland School for the Blind and Maryland School for the Deaf

In accordance with § 8-303 of the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, MSDE, each county board, the Maryland School for the Deaf and the Maryland School for the Blind shall work together to meet the educational needs of children who are deaf or blind.

The Maryland School for the Deaf

The Maryland School for the Deaf (MSD) is established under §8-304 of the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland. MSD is required to admit free of charge all students who are Maryland residents and meet the established admissions criteria. Section §8-305 requires each Local School System (LSS) to notify the parents or guardians of each hearing-impaired child of the availability of the educational programs offered by MSD. Funding for MSD is established under §8-310.3. MSD is also required to establish and operate a program of enhanced services for deaf students who have other moderate to severe disabilities under § 8-310.1 with funding provided jointly by the State and the county. The majority of students who are enrolled at MSD are placed by parents or guardians rather than by a LSS. Children receiving enhanced services* are placed by LSSs through the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team process. A small number of enrolled students live on campus weeknights during the school year, late August through early June.

The Maryland School for the Blind

The Maryland School for the Blind (MSB) is established to provide services for children placed by LSSs through the IEP team process. In accordance with §8-307.1 each LSS in the State shall notify the parents or guardians of each blind or visually-impaired child, including children with multiple disabilities, of the availability of the educational programs and administrative policies of the schools under their jurisdiction. MSB is also required to establish and operate a program of enhanced services* for students who are blind and have other disabilities. Funding for these services is provided jointly by the State and county. The budget for MSB is submitted annually by the Governor to the General Assembly. The residential program offers a continuum of service options. Students may participate in the program on an extended-day, part-time or full-time, and may reside in a dormitory or in a house on the campus.

*Note – Enhanced services allow students to receive educational services in Maryland rather in an out-of-State residential program.

Residential Placements

Maryland School for the Blind

	Total Residential Served	Residential Cost	Educational Cost	Total Cost
FY2010	86	\$4,760,670	\$7,628,494	\$12,389,164
FY2011	93	\$4,844,775	\$8,702,304	\$13,547,079
FY2012	89	\$4,722,467	\$8,316,387	\$13,038,854

Table 170: Maryland School for the Blind Total Costs

Maryland School for the Deaf

	Total Residential Served	Residential Cost	Educational Cost	Total Cost
FY2010	125	\$2,296,579	\$5,893,239	\$8,189,818
FY2011	111	\$2,253,601	\$5,031,852	\$7,285,453
FY2012	123	\$2,476,233	\$6,162,792	\$8,639,025

Table 171: Maryland School for the Deaf Total Costs

Section VIII: Family Preservation Services

Local Departments of Social Services (LDSS) have a long tradition of providing in-home services, when appropriate, to families showing moderate to serious risks of child maltreatment. Rooted in the 1980 federal child welfare law to make “reasonable efforts to prevent out-of-home placement,” Maryland has provided in-home interventions since the early 1980s. From 1990 to the present, Interagency Family Preservation Services (IFPS) was added in Maryland as an interagency approach to preserving families with children at imminent risk of placement from all child-serving Agencies.

Until FY2008 IFPS was administered by GOC, after which it was integrated into DHR’s In-Home services. DHR discontinued the use of the North Carolina Family Assessment Scale (NCFAS), in anticipation of using the Maryland Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths assessment (MD CANS). During FY2013 the family-oriented version of the CANS (CANS-F) will be implemented, which provides specific caregiver information and is intended to support a strengths-based case plans for in-home services. During FY2012 this new assessment was finalized, and Statewide implementation is anticipated during the winter of 2013. Data from the new assessment will not be available until the FY2014 report in December 2014. An interim assessment used to gauge the risk of maltreatment, the Maryland Family Risk Assessment (MFRA), therefore, is being reported in this year’s Report.

In addition, DHR In-Home services continues to undergo a consolidation that will both streamline the service structure and make better use of assessment data to gauge the intensity of in-home service that a family needs. This multi-year effort, which includes improvements to its child welfare information system (MD CHESSIE), involves a simplification of the service program categories, changes to DHR’s Safety assessment (SAFE-C), replacement of the Risk assessment (MFRA), and inclusion of the CANS-F. Once fully implemented, DHR will have a better set of integrated tools for its In-Home workforce to use, and will gain a well-rounded picture of a family’s safety, risk, and functioning that will assist with service planning and data reporting. Fiscal Year 2014 will be the first full year for all these new features to be in effect, as all of these changes are being implemented during FY2013.

Therefore, as DHR is transforming its In-Home services policies, practices, and information system, this Report contains the best available data during this time of transition.

Service Counts for DHR In-Home Services

The simplification of DHR In-Home service categories is a consolidation of a number of services introduced over the last few decades. Three basic services will be provided:

- Services to Families with Children – Intake (SFC-Intake: a short-term service featuring an assessment of family needs, which makes it an assessment-oriented in-home service);
- Interagency Family Preservation Services (transferred to DHR from GOC); and
- Consolidated In-Home Services (collapsing the rest of the former DHR in-home service categories into one).

For this Report, the data are organized as In-Home (all 3 categories), DHR In-Home (Consolidated and SFC-Intake), and IFPS.

A review of the last three years' information on overall served and newly-served indicates that there has been an increase in the overall number of families and children served in In-Home programs during FY2012. Chart 182 below contains three years of data for all In-Home services, DHR In-Home services, and IFPS.

Families and Children Served and Newly Served						
All Services: DHR In-Home Services, Interagency Family Preservation Services						
All Services						
	All Cases Served during FY			New Cases during FY		
	Cases	Children	Child/Case	Cases	Children	Child/Case
FY2010	7,899	17,265	2.2	5,534	11,927	2.2
FY2011	7,556	16,554	2.2	5,271	11,439	2.2
FY2012	8,743	18,806	2.2	6,512	13,799	2.1
DHR In-Home Services						
	All Cases Served during FY			New Cases during FY		
	Cases	Children	Child/Case	Cases	Children	Child/Case
FY2010	6,864	14,839	2.2	4,697	9,965	2.1
FY2011	6,591	14,279	2.2	4,496	9,618	2.1
FY2012	7,841	16,659	2.1	5,803	12,118	2.1
Interagency Family Preservation Services						
	All Cases Served during FY			New Cases during FY		
	Cases	Children	Child/Case	Cases	Children	Child/Case
FY2010	1,035	2,426	2.3	837	1,962	2.3
FY2011	965	2,275	2.4	775	1,821	2.3
FY2012	902	2,147	2.4	709	1,681	2.4

Chart 182

DHR In-Home served and newly-served families decreased by 4% and 5%, respectively, from FY2010 to FY2011, and then increased from FY2011 to FY2012 by 16% and 24%. This is the first substantial increase among In-Home services in years, and actually allays concerns about the downward trends in In-Home services in prior years during a time period in which DHR out-of-home Foster Care Placements have been decreasing significantly as well. The argument, if Foster Care Placements are decreasing, then In-Home services should be increasing, is reasonable; however, it ignores the increasing impact of DHR's roll-out of a new family-centered practice model, as part of its Place Matters Initiative, featuring the use of Family Involvement Meetings. During these meetings it is often the case that solutions excluding LDSS in-home or out-of-home services are found, making it possible for children to remain safely at home, and for whom relatives, friends, and other resources are found to support the family on an ongoing basis.

These two factors - downward trend in out-of-home placements, and upward trend to identify and make use of family resources - provide counteracting pressures on the In-Home service population. It is possible that the increase seen in FY2012 is a sign that family and relative

resources to help families with children at risk of out-of-home placement are shrinking, perhaps due to the prolonged economic recession experienced in Maryland and throughout the country during the last few years. Next year's update will help to determine whether DHR In-Home services will continue to see an increase in families and children served.

Analysis of Maryland Family Risk Assessment for In-Home Services

DHR In-Home workers are required to complete an MFRA while the family is receiving services. An intake and closing risk assessment is required, as well as additional ratings every six months or when the family situation changes. The assessment is six pages and includes a central section wherein workers score family observations in five risk categories: (a) History of Child Maltreatment, (b) Type and Extent of Current Child Maltreatment Investigation, (c) Child Characteristics, (d) Caregiver Characteristics, and (e) Familial, Social and Economic Characteristics. A four-level risk rating of no-risk, low-risk, moderate-risk, or high-risk is assigned by assessing past incidents or the current incident leading to In-Home services. The final section of the MFRA is the Overall Rating of Risk. Workers enter their summary risk ratings for the five preceding risk categories before assigning an overall rating of risk for the family. Workers use the overall family risk rating to inform their case management decisions including case opening.

Workers are trained on the MFRA during pre-service orientation and through ongoing supervision. Currently certification is not required in order to begin using the MFRA, which raises some concern about the validity and reliability of this assessment. DHR completed a review of MFRA in how well it assists workers with the task of predicting risk of maltreatment to the children it serves. The final outcome of this review is that MFRA will be replaced during FY2013. Details about the new assessment and its implementation will be included in next year's Report.

Analysis of MFRA data for In-Home services is therefore descriptive, and breakdowns between DHR In-Home services and Interagency Family Preservation Services are available as of FY2010.

MFRA Intake Ratings

Within two weeks of starting an In-Home service case, workers are required to complete a MFRA rating for the family. Based on data available in MD CHESSIE, it appears that this requirement is not fulfilled in one-fifth of the cases (18% in FY2010, 16% in FY2011, and 21% in FY2012). There are a couple possible reasons for this persistent lack of data. First, it is possible that the MFRA is completed during the investigation and then shared with the In-Home services team; second, this shortcoming may reflect a failure to document the results of the MFRA rating in MD CHESSIE, rather than the failure to make a MFRA rating. Efforts are continuing to scrutinize the quality of case record documentation, as part of DHR's new quality assurance program. There was slight improvement in the documentation of MFRA data from FY2010 to FY2011, but not in FY2012. Efforts in FY2013 will be to shift to the replacement risk assessment, and this activity will likely create a challenge in reporting on family risk in next year's report.

Chart 183 contains the initial MFRA ratings for all cases, DHR In-Home cases and Interagency Family Preservation Services. Although there is substantial missing data, a general pattern emerges for all cases: families rated at moderate risk are the most common group receiving services (ranging from 31% to 39% of families served from FY2010 to FY2012), followed closely by families with low risk (ranging from 27% to 29%). In addition, during FY2012, there is a noticeable shift in the proportion of families with no risk, doubling from 7%/8% in FY2010/FY2011 to 14% in FY2012.

Initial Risk based on MFRA Ratings						
All Services: DHR In-Home Services, Interagency Family Preservation Services						
DHR In-Home Services -- All Cases						
		Percent				
Fiscal Year	n	None	Low	Moderate	High	Missing
FY2010	7,899	7%	29%	37%	9%	18%
FY2011	7,556	8%	27%	39%	10%	16%
FY2012	8,743	14%	27%	31%	8%	21%
DHR In-Home Cases						
		Percent				
Fiscal Year	n	None	Low	Moderate	High	Missing
FY2010	6,862	8%	30%	36%	9%	17%
FY2011	6,590	9%	28%	37%	9%	17%
FY2012	7,840	15%	28%	29%	7%	21%
Interagency Family Preservation Services						
		Percent				
Fiscal Year	n	None	Low	Moderate	High	Missing
FY2010	1,037	4%	21%	42%	13%	20%
FY2011	966	3%	20%	47%	17%	13%
FY2012	903	4%	21%	48%	12%	15%

Chart 183

DHR In-Home cases, which represent 90% of all cases, include a wide range of families requiring In-Home services - it is not unreasonable to see larger proportions of those families starting out services with lower risk. Chart 184 isolates these percentages for FY2011 and FY2012 service cases.

Initial Risk based on MFRA Ratings				
All Services: DHR In-Home Services, Interagency Family Preservation Services				
FY2011 Proportion of Families Served starting out with No/Low Risk Ratings				
	No	Low	No/Low	
All Cases	8.0%	27.4%	35.4%	
DHR In-Home	8.7%	28.4%	37.2%	
IFPS	3.4%	20.3%	23.7%	
FY2012 Proportion of Families Served starting out with No/Low Risk Ratings				
	No	Low	No/Low	
All Cases	13.9%	26.9%	40.8%	
DHR In-Home	14.9%	27.6%	42.5%	
IFPS	4.4%	20.8%	25.2%	

Chart 184

Immediate safety concerns, rather than risk, may be the driving factor in starting an In-Home case, and the In-Home worker will monitor and provide service to the family to assure that there are no lingering safety issues. There are several factors that lead a family to In-Home Services, including immediate safety issues that are being addressed and resolved (meaning that risk of maltreatment is low and some level of monitoring is appropriate), the return home of a child in Out-of-Home Services and In-Home services are rendered to assure a smooth reunification process, and often there are concrete purchases (including rent, electricity, clothing, automobile repairs) accompanying the start of an In-Home case that helps to avoid the risk of maltreatment (particularly neglect).

IFPS, on the other hand, have a much different pattern of initial risk. These cases have a substantially higher proportion of families assessed at a moderate and high level of risk than the DHR In-Home cases. An average of 60% of IFPS cases during FY2010 through FY2012 have moderate to high levels of risk. Families receiving IFPS start services with a higher level of risk for child maltreatment than the DHR In-Home programs, which makes sense because IFPS services have traditionally focused on families with higher risks of out-of-home placement. DHR In-Home cases also include high-risk families, however, there is a broader range of risk among families eligible for DHR In-Home services.

MFRA Ratings: Comparing the Initial Risk Ratings with Subsequent and Final Risk Ratings

Data are available for comparing MFRA initial ratings with the most recent subsequent rating in new In-Home cases during the fiscal year, as well as comparing initial ratings with final risk ratings among families whose In-Home cases closed during the fiscal year. This analysis helps to answer two related questions: are families improving their risk rating while receiving In-Home services, and are families better off (*e.g.*, lowering their risk rating) by the end of In-Home services? The following charts help to illustrate the progress experienced by families receiving and completing services.

Comparing Initial and the Most Recent Risk Ratings Among New In-Home Cases

One of the goals is to reduce the level of risk for families who receive In-Home services. Among new In-Home cases in each fiscal year, one method for studying the changes in risk is to compare the initial risk rating for a family to the most recent risk rating documented for that family in order to observe any changes in risk during the course of services. Chart 185 presents data for families whose services started and MD CHESSIE contains the initial risk rating and at least one subsequent MFRA rating for the family.

Information about all new In-Home cases is displayed here, including the proportion of cases that have incomplete MFRA data for this analysis. Incomplete data could be related either to the fact that a subsequent risk rating has not yet been recorded for a newly-served family, or due to missing data in MD CHESSIE. The following observations pertain to newly-served cases where there has been at least one subsequent MFRA rating during the last three years.

- High Risk Families: Initially rated at overall high risks, 24% to 35% of families remain at a high risk; and 63% to 76% of families improve (*e.g.*, decrease) their risk;
- Moderate Risk Families: Initially rated at overall moderate risk, only 3% to 4% of families worsen in their level of risk; 33% to 48% of families remain at a moderate risk; and 48% to 62% improve their risk;
- Low Risk Families: Initially rated at overall low risk, 7% to 9% of families worsen in their level of risk; 77% to 81% remain at a low risk; and 12% to 14% improve their risk.

Comparison of Initial and Most Recent MFRA Ratings for New Cases							
Percent of Families Experiencing Worse, Same, or Improved Risk Rating during Services							
In-Home: All Services							
	Initial Risk	N	Based on Final Rating Risk Level was			Cases with Incomplete Data *	Percent Incomplete
			Worse	Same	Improved		
FY2010	High	716	0%	24%	76%	1,582	20%
	Moderate	2,925	4%	33%	62%		
	Low	2,244	9%	78%	13%		
	None	432	0%	100%	0%		
FY2011	High	736	0%	27%	73%	1,372	18%
	Moderate	2,901	4%	36%	60%		
	Low	2,066	9%	77%	14%		
	None	481	0%	100%	0%		
FY2012	High	667	0%	37%	63%	1,945	22%
	Moderate	2,690	3%	48%	48%		
	Low	2,337	7%	81%	12%		
	None	1,104	0%	100%	0%		

Chart 185

Among newly-served In-Home families, this descriptive analysis suggests that a far greater proportion of families experience decreased risk of child maltreatment while receiving In-Home

Services rather than the reverse. This has been the trend, although the performance in FY2012 is a little different compared to prior years—the same proportion of families experience worse levels of risk, which is good; however, a larger proportion of the FY2012 families appear to remain at the same level of risk rather than decreasing risk.

Comparing Initial and the Final Risk Ratings Among Closed In-Home Cases

The second method for studying the changes in risk is to review In-Home cases closed during each fiscal year and compare the initial risk rating for a family with the final risk rating to observe changes in risk from start to completion of the In-Home service. Chart 186 presents an initial to final risk change matrix: along the left side, the breakdown of families based on initial risk ratings, and then graphically illustrates the percentages of families by risk rating at case close. Incomplete risk ratings for closed cases (17% missing for FY2010, 17% missing for FY2011, and 19% missing for FY2012) hampers clarity. This analysis, however, provides some insight into the changes occurring among families receiving In-Home services.

In-Home: All Cases – FY2010 through FY2012

Matrix indicating Percent of Families at Final Risk Level, Based on Initial Risk Level

The gray-shaded cells in these matrices represent no change in risk rating from intake to final rating, yellow-shaded cells indicate a worsening in maltreatment risk, and the green-shaded cells represent improvement (i.e., a decrease) in risk.

FY2010	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	6,218	Total	1,037	3,594	1,281	306
	556	None	75%	19%	4%	2%
	2,173	Low	13%	78%	8%	1%
	2,807	Moderate	10%	54%	33%	4%
	682	High	10%	42%	25%	23%
	1,296	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				
FY2011	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	5,883	Total	1,011	3,338	1,225	309
	569	None	80%	15%	3%	1%
	1,951	Low	14%	78%	6%	1%
	2,698	Moderate	8%	54%	34%	4%
	665	High	10%	40%	24%	26%
	1,097	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				
FY2012	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	5,644	Total	1,447	2,856	1,061	280
	1,098	None	93%	6%	1%	1%
	1,987	Low	13%	82%	4%	1%
	2,045	Moderate	7%	49%	41%	3%
	514	High	7%	33%	25%	35%
	1,435	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				

Chart 186

The percentages contained in Chart 186 correspond to the count of families in each of the Initial Risk categories. For example, during FY2010, 682 families (for whom both an initial and final MFRA rating was recorded in MD CHESSIE) entered In-Home services with a High level of maltreatment risk. By the time of closing the case, 10% of those families had no risk, 42% had low risk, 25% had moderate risk, and 23% still had a high level of maltreatment risk.

Among those families who received both an initial and final MFRA risk rating, the overall proportions of families who decreased or held steady in their level of risk ranged from 93% in FY2010 to 95% in FY2012. Complete data are needed to make firm conclusions, but preliminary findings are that most families experience no change or a decrease in risk during the course of In-Home services, and this pattern is persistent.

Additional MFRA Risk Rating change matrices are presented as well for FY2010 and FY2011, for the DHR In-Home served families, and the IFPS served families. Because the bulk of families are served in DHR In-Home, the first part of Chart 187 resembles the Statewide presentation of all In-Home services shown in Chart 186.

DHR In-Home Services -- FY2010 and FY2011
Matrix indicating Percent of Families at Final Risk Level, Based on Initial Risk Level
DHR In-Home Services

The gray-shaded cells in these matrices represent no change in risk rating from intake to final rating, yellow-shaded cells indicate a worsening in maltreatment risk, and the green-shaded cells represent improvement (e.g. a decrease) in risk.

FY2010	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	5,421	Total	942	3,164	1,065	250
	522	None	75%	19%	4%	2%
	1,966	Low	13%	79%	7%	1%
	2,383	Moderate	10%	54%	32%	4%
	550	High	11%	41%	24%	24%
	1,107	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				
FY2011	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	5,073	Total	931	2,906	978	258
	536	None	80%	15%	3%	1%
	1,765	Low	14%	78%	7%	1%
	2,263	Moderate	8%	55%	33%	4%
	509	High	11%	42%	20%	27%
	992	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				
FY2012	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	4,992	Total	1,378	2,535	840	239
	1,059	None	93%	6%	1%	1%
	1,829	Low	13%	81%	4%	1%
	1,686	Moderate	7%	50%	39%	4%
	418	High	8%	33%	23%	36%
	1,327	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				

Chart 187

Prior to shifting over to DHR in FY2008, IFPS had stringent eligibility requirements, focused on families with children at imminent risk of out-of-home placement, and its service model featured lower caseloads and higher requirements for contact (face-to-face time) with family members. As part of the shift to DHR, eligibility criteria were subject to local preferences, along with service model design changes that LDSS offices expected would make the interagency program work best in the local Agency. These kinds of changes may have led to a loosening of eligibility criteria as well as variations in service delivery from one jurisdiction to another.

Even so, it is possible that some remnant of the historically intensive focus of IFPS may have persisted after its absorption into the LDSS in-home service array. Based on the information

presented, it appears that IFPS families tend to start services with higher levels of risk (Chart 184). It also appears (Chart 187 and Chart 188) that a larger proportion of IFPS families initially rated high risk experience decreased risk by case closing (82% in FY2010, 79% in FY2011, 68% in FY2012), compared to families initially rated high risk in the DHR In-Home Services population (76% in FY2010, 73% in FY2011, 64% in FY2012).

As time passes, however, the positive impact in reducing risk among families rated initially at high-risk has diminished in both In-Home and IFPS services, as the proportion of high-risk families at intake who have less risk at case closing has decreased. In FY2012, only 65% of families served by In-Home or by IFPS experienced less risk at case closing, compared to 77% in FY2010. This may be the result of stubborn challenges facing families during the persisting economic recession.

DHR Interagency Family Preservation Services -- FY2010 and FY2011
Matrix indicating Percent of Families at Final Risk Level, Based on Initial Risk Level
Interagency Family Preservation Services

FY2010	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	797	Total	95	430	216	56
	34	None	76%	12%	9%	3%
	207	Low	13%	72%	11%	4%
	424	Moderate	8%	51%	36%	5%
	132	High	8%	45%	30%	18%
	188	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				
FY2011	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	810	Total	80	432	247	51
	33	None	82%	15%	3%	0%
	186	Low	11%	82%	5%	2%
	435	Moderate	4%	51%	41%	4%
	156	High	9%	34%	37%	21%
	105	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				
FY2012	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	652	Total	69	321	221	41
	39	None	85%	13%	3%	0%
	158	Low	10%	82%	8%	0%
	359	Moderate	4%	44%	50%	3%
	96	High	6%	30%	31%	32%
	108	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				

Chart 188

Another more pressing matter that MFRA risk ratings reveal, however, is that a sizable proportion of families served throughout DHR’s In-Home Services and IFPS reach the end of services at moderate and high levels of risk of maltreatment. Overall, an average of 25% of families end services with moderate to high levels of risk. Further, among the children who received some type of In-Home service during FY2010 (17,265), FY2011 (16,554), and FY2012

(18,806), it can be roughly estimated that, applying the proportion of families receiving final risk ratings in Chart 186, 850 children in FY2010, nearly 870 children in FY2011, and more than 930 children in FY2012 ended In-Home services at a high level of risk. It should be a concern that 2,650 children who, based on an extrapolation of MFRA ratings discussed in this section, ended services with their families at high risk of maltreatment during the last 3 years.

It is quite possible that many of these children were removed from their homes if the risk of maltreatment was too high to let them remain safely at home. Frontline Child Protective Services (CPS) workers and In-Home workers make that kind of decision every day throughout Maryland, both during the time that a child is involved with an In-Home service, and after the In-Home service case has closed. There is also the possibility that a CPS investigation may have been initiated and conducted either during an In-Home service, or after In-Home services have closed.

The next section addresses these issues, and answers the question as to whether children, during In-Home services, or within one year of closing In-Home services, experience either an indicated CPS investigation, or a Foster Care Placement.

Analysis of Indicated Findings of Child Maltreatment and Non-Placement Rates

This analysis focuses mainly on the question “Are the children better off?” by measuring the absence of “bad” outcomes: the occurrence of “indicated” CPS findings, and placement in Foster Care. As such, these indicators are somewhat problematic because, for some children, the risk of maltreatment is the principle concern: having a CPS investigation and being placed in Foster Care is often a “good” outcome. As estimated in the previous section, there are 2,650 children ending their In-Home services at a high risk of maltreatment during FY2010 through FY2012. These indicators therefore are examined to assure that most children served at home do not experience these “bad” outcomes, and to understand the magnitude and trends among those children who do experience these “bad” outcomes.

The goal of In-Home services is to support the family in caring for its children, and to remove the risk of maltreatment, not the children, from their homes. Families generally want to stay together even when challenges and serious deficiencies exist, and the LDSS In-Home staff members strive to assist with reaching that goal. Parents ultimately are responsible for making this work, and when it does not work for a family, CPS investigations may need to be initiated and sometimes children need to be removed from their homes. In the course of providing In-Home services, therefore, it is often during services that a CPS investigation needs to be initiated to address safety and risk issues, and/or the need for foster care placement becomes strongly supported and implemented.

An “indicated” CPS finding refers to a decision made by a CPS investigator, upon completion of a child maltreatment investigation, that there is sufficient evidence, which has not been refuted, of child maltreatment. There are two other CPS findings, not reported here, including an “unsubstantiated” finding, meaning that there is not sufficient evidence to support the contention that maltreatment took place, or a “ruled out” finding, meaning that child protective services determined that maltreatment did not take place.

Foster Care Placement begins with a removal from the home of a child for whom there is a serious safety or maltreatment risk, and the date of removal marks the beginning of the Foster Care episode. In this analysis, only Foster Care Placement is discussed—other Maryland agencies place or fund the placement of children, however, this year’s Report concerns only Foster Care Placement among the children who have participated in DHR’s In-Home services.

Three year’s data has been compiled from MD CHESSIE to answer the following questions: (1) during the provision of In-Home services, did a CPS investigation resulting in an indicated finding or a Foster Care Placement occur for children receiving service, and (2) during the year following In-Home case closure, did an Indicated CPS investigation or a Foster Care Placement occur among children who had received service. These measures have been constructed as follows:

- During Services – For each fiscal year listed, the children newly-served in In-Home cases during that fiscal year are considered, and the observation time period for each child is the start of In-Home services to the first of either:
 - the In-Home service close date; or
 - 12 months following the start date of In-Home services.
- Within 1 Year of Case Close – For each fiscal year listed, the children considered are those who were newly-served during the fiscal year and whose In-Home cases closed within 12 months of the start date of In-Home Services. In other words, these are the same children as the “During Services” children whose cases closed during the 12-month observation period.

Chart 189 displays the counts of cases (families) and children newly-served each fiscal year, along with the counts and proportions of newly-served families whose cases closed within one year. It is evident that the majority of cases close within a year of starting. The child population associated with these cases were observed a year after case closing to determine whether a CPS Indicated Investigation or Foster Care Placement occurred. For the “During Services” observation period, it is necessary for a year to elapse after the reported fiscal year ends. For the “Within 1 Year of Case Closure” observation period, it is necessary for two years to elapse after the reported fiscal year ends. This means that, for this year’s Report, complete statistics are available for FY2008 through FY2010, and only “During Service” statistics are available for FY2011.

In-Home Cases (All)					
	In-Home Newly-Served Case Statistics			In-Home Child Statistics	
Fiscal Year	Newly Served Cases	Newly-Served & Closed Cases Within 1 Year	% Closed within 1 Year	Newly-Served Children	Newly-Served & Closed Within 1 Year
FY2008	6,819	6,019	88.3%	14,474	12,641
FY2009	6,290	5,540	88.1%	13,541	11,755
FY2010	5,534	4,791	86.6%	11,927	10,257
FY2011	5,271	4,561	86.5%	11,439	9,797

Chart 189

Using this construct, Chart 190 contains information concerning CPS Indicated Investigations and Foster Care Placement among children who received In-Home services, both during services and within one year of case closing. Each statistic will be examined in turn.

Indicated CPS Investigations

During service, the four-year rates for this indicator have increased, from 2.1% in FY2008 to 3.7% in FY2011. While this means the 96.3% of children receiving In-Home in FY2010 have not received an Indicated CPS Investigation, it also means that from FY2009 to FY2011, 1,251 children received an indicated CPS finding during services. There does appear to be an upward trend in Indicated CPS Investigations, although there is no change in this percentage from FY2010 to FY2011.

Indicated CPS Findings and Foster Care Placement Rates								
All Services: DHR In-Home Services, Interagency Family Preservation Services								
In-Home Cases (All)								
Fiscal Year	Indicated CPS Investigation				Out-of-Home Placement			
	During Services		Within 1 Year of Case Close		During Services		Within 1 Year of Case Close	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
FY2008	2.1%	301	2.8%	353	3.1%	445	1.6%	206
FY2009	2.8%	384	3.2%	382	3.8%	509	2.2%	261
FY2010	3.7%	446	3.9%	398	4.5%	534	2.2%	227
FY2011	3.7%	421	NA until FY13		5.3%	601	NA until FY13	

Chart 190

Within one year of case closure, there has been an upward trend among the children associated with closed cases who have experienced an Indicated CPS Investigation, from 2.8% in FY2008 to 3.9% in FY2010.

Starting with FY2010 DHR had complete data for In-Home Services and Interagency Family Preservation Services (Table 10).

Indicated CPS Findings and Foster Care Placement Rates								
All Services: DHR In-Home Services, Interagency Family Preservation Services								
DHR In-Home Services								
Fiscal Year	Indicated CPS Investigation				Out-of-Home Placement			
	During Services		Within 1 Year of Case Close		During Services		Within 1 Year of Case Close	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
FY2010	3.9%	392	3.9%	332	4.7%	465	2.1%	182
FY2011	4.0%	385	NA until FY13		5.7%	545	NA until FY13	
Interagency Family Preservation Services								
Fiscal Year	Indicated CPS Investigation				Out-of-Home Placement			
	During Services		Within 1 Year of Case Close		During Services		Within 1 Year of Case Close	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
FY2010	2.8%	54	3.8%	66	3.5%	69	2.6%	45
FY2011	2.0%	36	NA until FY13		3.1%	56	NA until FY13	

Chart 191

During services, there is a difference in outcomes between DHR In-Home Services and Interagency Family Preservation Services (Chart 190), whereby the DHR In-Home Services appears to have a higher proportion of Indicated CPS Investigations for both FY2010 and FY2011. In fact, for FY2011, DHR In-Home reaches 4.0% of its cases experiencing an Indicated CPS Investigation during service, which is double the percent of Indicated CPS Investigations among IFPS cases. As both of these CPS statistics - percent of indicated findings during In-Home service and within one year of case closing - have seen some increases in the last two years, DHR will review these services with local jurisdictions, in order to assure that appropriate families are receiving In-Home services, and that the appropriate level of service is provided.

Absence of Foster Care Placement

During service, the Foster Care Placement rate for this indicator has increased from 3.1% in FY2008 to 5.3% in FY2011. For DHR In-Home services, the increase has been the greatest, from 4.7% in FY2010 through 5.7% in FY2011, whereas for IFPS services, there was a decrease in the Foster Care Placement rate from 3.5% to 3.1%.

Although it is largely good news in that 94.7% of children receiving In-Home services do not experience a Foster Care Placement, it still means that from FY2009 to FY2011, 1,644 children were removed from their homes during In-Home services. As discussed earlier, the LDSS In-Home workers strive to reach the goal of preserving families, but the successful result of that effort hinges on the parents to make that happen for their families. Therefore it is not necessarily a bad outcome for children who truly need it to be removed and placed in Foster Care. At this point, when Foster Care Placement is necessary, the LDSS workers have a much better experience with the child who needs to be placed, and the opportunity of having provided In-

Home services enables the LDSS to make an appropriate Foster Care Placement when it is necessary.

Within one year of case closure, the rate of out-of-home placement has risen from 1.6% among children newly-served in FY2008 to 2.2% in FY2009, and remains at 2.2% for FY2010. DHR In-Home Services has experienced the lower rate of Foster Care Placement in FY2010 (2.1%) whereas the IFPS rate is 2.6%.

Although direct number comparisons cannot be made, the magnitude of children whose families remain at high risk of maltreatment at the end of In-Home services (2,650 from FY2010-FY2012) roughly matches the magnitude of children who, during In-Home services from FY2009 to FY2011, experienced either an Indicated CPS Investigation or a Foster Care Placement (1,251 and 1,644, respectively). These statistics provide some assurance that DHR demonstrates a positive agency response to children whom it knows, and whose safety and risk factors, in spite of efforts to keep families together, sometimes must be resolved by responding to findings of child maltreatment, or by placing children in Foster Care.

Summary

DHR In-Home services are a critical component of meeting the needs of thousands of vulnerable children and their families. In FY2012 just over 18,800 children received In-Home services while just over 10,420 children received Foster Care services. DHR's Place Matters Initiative has had considerable success in its emphasis on family-centered practice and the use of family involvement meetings to find alternatives for children to entering the child welfare system.

Among those served in In-Home services, based on FY2010 (most recent year for which there is complete data), most children served:

- Do not experience an "indicated" CPS investigation (96.3%) during services, and
- Do not experience a Foster Care Placement (95.5%) during services.

In addition, among those children whose In-Home services ended, based on FY2010, most children:

- Do not experience an "indicated" CPS investigation (96.1%) within 1 year of case close, and
- Do not experience a Foster Care Placement (97.8%) within 1 year of case close.

DHR has experienced success in reducing its Foster Care population, shifting its placement population away from group care and toward family-based care, and reducing overall costs of Foster Care placements through the Place Matters Initiative and Family-Centered Practice. Family-Centered Practice continues to be implemented by including family involvement meetings at critical trigger points during child welfare service delivery and a focus on family resources who can support relatives going through difficult times. Data quality in MD CHESSIE continues to improve substantially, and DHR's child welfare quality assurance program continues to examine both the quality of care as well as the quality of data entry. The focus of the frontline remains on safety, permanence, and well-being for our most vulnerable children, trying first to preserve and support families, and turning to Foster Care Placement only when necessary.

APPENDIX 1: Capacity Utilization by Placement Category

Family Home Settings

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Who Reported
Adoptive	OTHER PROVIDERS				0	0	0		40	DHR
Foster Care					0	0	0	Washington	2	DJS
Foster Care					0	0	0	Garrett	1	DJS
Foster Care					0	0	0	Washington	2	DJS
Foster Care					0	0	0	Washington	1	DJS
Foster Care	OTHER PROVIDERS				0	0	0		1287	DHR
LA_FH	OTHER PROVIDERS				0	0	0		304	DHR
Relative Care	OTHER PROVIDERS				0	0	0		1184	DHR
Restricted Relative Care	OTHER PROVIDERS				0	0	0		466	DHR
TFC		Arrow Child and Family Ministries - Foster Care			0	0	0	Baltimore	4	DJS
TFC		Concern - Treatment Foster Care			0	0	0	Washington	1	DJS
TFC		Contemporary Family Services, Inc			0	0	0	Prince George's	2	DJS
TFC		Foundations for Home and Community - TFC			0	0	0	Charles	1	DJS
TFC		Hearts & Homes for Youth - Family Ties Treat FC			0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DJS

TFC		Maple Shade Youth and Family Services, Inc - After Care - Treatment Foster Care			0	0	0	Wicomico	1	DJS
TFC		Mentor Maryland - Baltimore Teens In Transition			0	0	0	Anne Arundel	19	DJS
TFC		Mentor Maryland - Community Based Services			0	0	0	Baltimore	4	DJS
TFC		Mentor Maryland - Easton Children's Services			0	0	0	Talbot	15	DJS
TFC		Mentor Maryland - Salisbury Teens In Transition			0	0	0	Wicomico	9	DJS
TFC		Multi-Dimensional TFC (Baltimore County) - Community Solutions, Inc.			0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DJS
TFC		Pressley Ridge - Treatment Foster Care			0	0	0	Allegany	8	DJS
TFC		San Mar Treatment Foster Care			0	0	0	Washington	1	DJS
TFC	The ARC Northern Chesapeake Region, Incorporated	ARC Northern Chesapeake Aberdeen	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	36	0	21	Harford	27	DHR
TFC	The ARC Baltimore, Inc.	The Arc Baltimore Treatment and Specialized FC	DHR	CPA: TFC Medically Fragile	40	0	20	Baltimore	34	DHR

TFC	Arrow Child & Family Ministries of Maryland, Inc.	Arrow Child & Family - CPA TFC Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	78	0	18	Baltimore	66	DHR
TFC	Associated Catholic Charities Inc.	Associated Catholic Charities, TFC, Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	79	0	21	Baltimore City	48	DHR
TFC	Associated Catholic Charities Inc.	Associated Catholic Charities, TFC, 1301 Continental Dr	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	79	0	21	Harford	19	DHR
TFC	The Children's Choice Of Maryland, Inc.	Children's Choice Stevensville	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	109	0	20	Queen Anne's	22	DHR
TFC	The Children's Choice Of Maryland, Inc.	Children's Choice Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	109	0	20	Baltimore City	47	DHR
TFC	The Children's Choice Of Maryland, Inc.	Children's Choice Salisbury	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	109	0	20	Wicomico	17	DHR
TFC	The Children's Home, Inc.	The Children's Home Edgewood Street Treatment Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	36	0	20	Baltimore	22	DHR
TFC	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - Family Ties Treatment Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	24	0	21	Montgomery	12	DHR
TFC	Pressley Ridge, Inc.	Pressley Ridge Cumberland	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	51	0	20	Allegany	16	DHR

TFC	Pressley Ridge, Inc.	Pressley Ridge Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	54	0	21	Baltimore City	51	DHR
TFC	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - Damamli Independent Living	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	24	18	21	Baltimore	12	DHR
TFC	Residential Care, Inc.	Residential Care, Inc. Crofton	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	16	0	20	Anne Arundel	1	DHR
TFC	The National Center for Children and Families, Inc.	National Center for Children and Families CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	30	0	21	Montgomery	16	DHR
TFC	Residential Care, Inc.	Residential Care, Inc. Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	80	0	20	Baltimore City	71	DHR
TFC	Woodbourne Center, Inc.	Woodbourne - Treatment Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	76	0	20	Baltimore	43	DHR
TFC	PSI Services, Inc.	PSI Services -- Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	41	0	21	Baltimore	47	DHR
TFC	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland - Lanham	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	227	0	20	Prince George's	1	DHR
TFC	Contemporary Family Services, Inc.	Contemporary Family Services (Vier Mill Wheaton)	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	45	0	21	Montgomery	1	DHR
TFC	WIN Family Services, Inc.	WIN Family Services, Inc. CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	91	0	21	Baltimore City	57	DHR

TFC	Second Home, Incorporated	Second Home CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	35	0	21	Baltimore City	21	DHR
TFC	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	29	0	21	Baltimore	18	DHR
TFC	Baltimore Adolescent Treatment Guidance Organization, Inc.	Baltimore Adolescent Treatment Guidance Organization CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	24	16	21	Baltimore City	20	DHR
TFC	The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Inc.	The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Inc. TFC Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	45	0	20	Baltimore City	21	DHR
TFC	The Martin Pollak Project, Inc.	Martin Pollak Treatment Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	78	0	20	Baltimore City	76	DHR
TFC	Foundations for Home and Community, Inc.	Foundations For Home and Community CPA-Clinton	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	103	0	21	Prince George's	103	DHR
TFC	CONCERN - Professional for Children and Youth, Inc	CONCERN Lanham CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	46	0	20	Prince George's	49	DHR
TFC	Neighbor to Family, Inc.	Neighbor to Family Sibling Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	83	0	20	Baltimore	71	DHR
TFC	Sheridan Patterson Center for Holistic Family Services, Inc	Sheridan Patterson Center CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	41	0	15	Baltimore	24	DHR

TFC	Williams Life Center, Inc.	Williams Life Center, Inc. CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	49	0	20	Prince George's	25	DHR
TFC	Progressive Life Center, Inc.	Progressive Life Center, Inc. - Landover TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	62	0	20	Prince George's	37	DHR
TFC	Baptist Family and Children's Services of Maryland, Inc.	Baptist Family and Children's Services Columbia CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	55	0	21	Howard	41	DHR
TFC	KidsPeace National Centers of North America, Inc.	KidsPeace CPA - Columbia	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	40	0	21	Howard	27	DHR
TFC	Kennedy Krieger Institute, Inc.	Kennedy Krieger TFC Program	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	50	0	21	Baltimore City	73	DHR
TFC	PSI Services, Inc.	PSI Services -- Chevy Chase	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	25	0	21	Montgomery	1	DHR
TFC	Maple Shade Youth and Family Services, Inc.	Maple Shade TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	6	0	21	Wicomico	6	DHR
TFC	San Mar Children's Home, Inc.	San Mar Children's Home Inc. TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	40	0	20	Washington	37	DHR
TFC	The Children's Choice Of Maryland, Inc.	Children's Choice Inc College Park	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	109	0	20	Prince George's	21	DHR
TFC	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland - Easton	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	227	0	21	Talbot	13	DHR

TFC	Family and Children's Services of Central Maryland Inc.	Family and Children's Services of Central MD CPA	DHR	CPA: TFC Medically Fragile	25	0	20	Baltimore City	6	DHR
TFC	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland - 5720 Executive	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	227	0	21	Baltimore	191	DHR
TFC	The Children's Guild, Inc.	Children's Guild TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	60	0	21	Baltimore City	52	DHR
TFC	Contemporary Family Services, Inc.	Contemporary Family Services (Hyattsville)	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	142	0	21	Prince George's	102	DHR
TFC	Good Children in the Making, Inc.	Good Children in the Making - Family Services TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	18	0	21	Prince George's	9	DHR
TFC	Progressive Horizons, Inc.	Progressive Horizons CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	30	0	20	Baltimore	7	DHR
TFC	Center for Progressive Learning, Inc.	Center for Progressive Learning DDA	DDA	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	4	0	21	Baltimore	4	DHR
TFC	Boys Town Washington DC, Inc	Boys Town Washington DC, Inc TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	6	0	21	Prince George's	2	DHR
TFC	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland Caton Center	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	49	0	21	Baltimore	19	DHR
TFC	Contemporary Family Services, Inc.	Contemporary Family Services (Baltimore)	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	142	0	21	Baltimore City	37	DHR

TFC	Seraaj Family Homes, Inc.	Seraaj Family Homes - Riverdale CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	29	0	21	Prince George's	8	DHR
TFC	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland - 5750 Executive	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	110	0	21	Baltimore	1	DHR
TFC	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland - Salisbury	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	49	0	21	Wicomico	2	DHR
TFC	Between Friends, Inc.	Between Friends - Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	30	0	20	Baltimore City	24	DHR
TFC	Arrow Child & Family Ministries of Maryland, Inc.	Arrow Child & Family - CPA TFC Salisbury	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	30	0	18	Wicomico	10	DHR
TFC	Parker Therapeutic Services, Inc.	Parker Therapeutic Services - Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	40	0	20	Baltimore City	46	DHR
TFC	Progressive Life Center, Inc.	Progressive Life Center - 2641 Maryland Ave	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	62	0	20	Baltimore City	7	DHR
TFC	Foundations for Home and Community, Inc.	Foundations for Home and Community CPA - Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	1	0	21	Baltimore	1	DHR
TFC	KidsPeace National Centers of North America, Inc.	Kidspeace CPA - Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	40	0	21	Baltimore City	5	DHR
TFC	NHS Maryland	NHS Maryland CPA - Rockville	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	5	12	17	Montgomery	4	DHR

TFC	Community Solutions, Inc.	Community Solutions, Inc - CPA Towson	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	8	0	20	Baltimore	9	DHR
TFC	Seraaj Family Homes, Inc.	Seraaj Family Homes - Joppa CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	29	0	21	Baltimore	7	DHR
TFC	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care TFC - Charlotte Hall	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	7	0	21	St. Mary's	5	DHR
TFC	Brook Lane Health Services, Inc.	Brook Lane - Residential Group Home	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	8	13	18	Washington	4	DHR
TFC	OTHER PROVIDERS				0	0	0		32	DHR

Community-Based Residential Placements

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Who Reported
CSLA	ARC OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY INC	ARC OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY INC		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	ARC OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY INC	ARC OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY INC		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	2	DDA
CSLA	THE CENTER FOR LIFE ENRICHMENT	THE CENTER FOR LIFE ENRICHMENT		CSLA	0	0	0	St. Mary's	1	DDA
CSLA	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT		CSLA	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	1	DDA
CSLA	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT		CSLA	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	1	DDA
CSLA	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT		CSLA	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	1	DDA
CSLA	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT		CSLA	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	1	DDA
CSLA	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT		CSLA	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	1	DDA
CSLA	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT		CSLA	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	1	DDA
CSLA	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT		CSLA	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	2	DDA
CSLA	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT	LT JOSEPH P KENNEDY INSTIT		CSLA	0	0	0	Non-MD Resident	1	DDA

CSLA	JEWISH SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY	JEWISH SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	JEWISH SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY	JEWISH SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	COMPASS, INC.	COMPASS, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	BAY COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES, INC.	BAY COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	DDA
CSLA	BAY COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES, INC.	BAY COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	DDA
CSLA	ALLIANCE	ALLIANCE		CSLA	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	HOWARD COUNTY ARC	HOWARD COUNTY ARC		CSLA	0	0	0	Howard	1	DDA
CSLA	CHIMES INC.	CHIMES INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	DDA
CSLA	JEWISH COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC.	JEWISH COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	DDA
CSLA	JEWISH COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC.	JEWISH COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	DDA
CSLA	EMERGE	EMERGE		CSLA	0	0	0	Howard	1	DDA
CSLA	EMERGE	EMERGE		CSLA	0	0	0	Howard	1	DDA
CSLA	ARC OF NORTHERN CHEASPEAKE	ARC OF NORTHERN CHEASPEAKE		CSLA	0	0	0	Harford	1	DDA
CSLA	ARC OF NORTHERN CHEASPEAKE	ARC OF NORTHERN CHEASPEAKE		CSLA	0	0	0	Harford	1	DDA
CSLA	EPILEPSY ASSOC OF EASTERN SHORE	EPILEPSY ASSOC OF EASTERN SHORE		CSLA	0	0	0	Wicomico	1	DDA

CSLA	EPILEPSY ASSOC OF EASTERN SHORE	EPILEPSY ASSOC OF EASTERN SHORE		CSLA	0	0	0	Wicomico	1	DDA
CSLA	LIVING HOPE, INC.	LIVING HOPE, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	DDA
CSLA	THE ARC OF THE CENTRAL CHESAPEAKE REGION, INC.	THE ARC OF THE CENTRAL CHESAPEAKE REGION, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	DDA
CSLA	THE ARC OF THE CENTRAL CHESAPEAKE REGION, INC.	THE ARC OF THE CENTRAL CHESAPEAKE REGION, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	DDA
CSLA	THE ARC OF THE CENTRAL CHESAPEAKE REGION, INC.	THE ARC OF THE CENTRAL CHESAPEAKE REGION, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	DDA
CSLA	ARC/WASHINGTON CO.	ARC/WASHINGTON CO.		CSLA	0	0	0	Washington	2	DDA
CSLA	ARC/WASHINGTON CO.	ARC/WASHINGTON CO.		CSLA	0	0	0	Washington	1	DDA
CSLA	ARC/WASHINGTON CO.	ARC/WASHINGTON CO.		CSLA	0	0	0	Washington	1	DDA
CSLA	ARC/WASHINGTON CO.	ARC/WASHINGTON CO.		CSLA	0	0	0	Washington	1	DDA
CSLA	ARC OF CARROLL COUNTY INC	ARC OF CARROLL COUNTY INC		CSLA	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DDA
CSLA	ARC OF CARROLL COUNTY INC	ARC OF CARROLL COUNTY INC		CSLA	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DDA
CSLA	CHANGE, INC.	CHANGE, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DDA
CSLA	CHANGE, INC.	CHANGE, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DDA
CSLA	CHANGE, INC.	CHANGE, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DDA
CSLA	TARGET, INC.	TARGET, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DDA
CSLA	TARGET, INC.	TARGET, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Carroll	1	DDA

CSLA	MARYLAND COMMUNITY CONNECTION	MARYLAND COMMUNITY CONNECTION		CSLA	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	DDA
CSLA	MARYLAND COMMUNITY CONNECTION	MARYLAND COMMUNITY CONNECTION		CSLA	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	DDA
CSLA	COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES	COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES	COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES	COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES	COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES	COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES	COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES	COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	HUMANIM	HUMANIM		CSLA	0	0	0	Howard	1	DDA
CSLA	HUMANIM	HUMANIM		CSLA	0	0	0	Howard	1	DDA
CSLA	HUMANIM	HUMANIM		CSLA	0	0	0	Howard	1	DDA
CSLA	SOMERSET COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC.	SOMERSET COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Somerset	1	DDA
CSLA	SOMERSET COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC.	SOMERSET COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Somerset	1	DDA
CSLA	THE ARC BALTIMORE	THE ARC BALTIMORE		CSLA	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	THE ARC BALTIMORE	THE ARC BALTIMORE		CSLA	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	THE ARC BALTIMORE	THE ARC BALTIMORE		CSLA	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA

CSLA	THE ARC BALTIMORE	THE ARC BALTIMORE		CSLA	0	0	0	Baltimore	2	DDA
CSLA	THE ARC BALTIMORE	THE ARC BALTIMORE		CSLA	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	THE ARC BALTIMORE	THE ARC BALTIMORE		CSLA	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	THE ARC BALTIMORE	THE ARC BALTIMORE		CSLA	0	0	0	Baltimore	2	DDA
CSLA	DOVE POINTE RESIDENTIAL SVC	DOVE POINTE RESIDENTIAL SVC		CSLA	0	0	0	Wicomico	1	DDA
CSLA	POOL OF BETHESDA COMMUNITY SERVIES, INC.	POOL OF BETHESDA COMMUNITY SERVIES, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	DDA
CSLA	SYKESVILLE WOODS, INC.	SYKESVILLE WOODS, INC.		CSLA	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	DDA
CSLA	RICHCROFT	RICHCROFT		CSLA	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	RICHCROFT	RICHCROFT		CSLA	0	0	0	Baltimore	2	DDA
CSLA	RICHCROFT	RICHCROFT		CSLA	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	RICHCROFT	RICHCROFT		CSLA	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
CSLA	ARC OF SOUTHERN MARYLAND INC	ARC OF SOUTHERN MARYLAND INC		CSLA	0	0	0	Calvert	1	DDA
CSLA	MELWOOD HORTICULTURAL TRAINING CENTER	MELWOOD HORTICULTURAL TRAINING CENTER		CSLA	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	DDA
CSLA	MELWOOD HORTICULTURAL TRAINING CENTER	MELWOOD HORTICULTURAL TRAINING CENTER		CSLA	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	DDA
CSLA	ARC OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY INC	ARC OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY INC		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA

CSLA	ARC OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY INC	ARC OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY INC		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	ARC OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY INC	ARC OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY INC		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
CSLA	ARC OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY INC	ARC OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY INC		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	2	DDA
CSLA	ARC OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY INC	ARC OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY INC		CSLA	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DDA
Independent Living	COMPASS, INC.	COMPASS, INC.		ALU	0	0	0	Montgomery	2	DDA
Independent Living	CREATIVE OPTIONS	CREATIVE OPTIONS		ALU	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
Independent Living	LIVING SANS FRONTIERES, INC.	LIVING SANS FRONTIERES, INC.		ALU	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
Independent Living	LIVING SANS FRONTIERES, INC.	LIVING SANS FRONTIERES, INC.		ALU	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
Independent Living	CBAI	CBAI		ALU	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DDA
Independent Living	SOMERSET COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC.	SOMERSET COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC.		ALU	0	0	0	Somerset	1	DDA
Independent Living	DOVE POINTE RESIDENTIAL SVC	DOVE POINTE RESIDENTIAL SVC		ALU	0	0	0	Wicomico	1	DDA
Independent Living		Arrow Child and Family Ministries - Transitional Living Program			0	0	0	Harford	3	DJS
Independent Living	BAY SHORE SERVICES, INC.	BAY SHORE SERVICES, INC.		ALU	0	0	0	Wicomico	1	DDA
Independent Living		Hearts and Homes - Damamli Independent Living Program			0	0	0	Baltimore	2	DJS

Independent Living		Mentor Maryland - Baltimore - Independent Living			0	0	0	Baltimore	6	DJS
Independent Living		National Center for Children and Families - Future Bound Independent Living			0	0	0	Montgomery	5	DJS
Independent Living	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - Damamli Independent Living	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	24	18	21	Baltimore	2	DHR
Independent Living	Mosaic Community Services, Inc.	Mosaic Community Services, Inc. TAY Program	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	12	16	21	Baltimore	8	DHR
Independent Living	The National Center for Children and Families, Inc.	National Center for Children and Families CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	30	0	21	Montgomery	4	DHR
Independent Living	Challengers Independent Living, Inc.	Challengers Independent Living	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	28	16	21	Baltimore	28	DHR
Independent Living	Wellington Incorporated	Wellington Inc -- Kindness House ILP	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	20	16	21	Prince George's	12	DHR
Independent Living	King Edwards' Inc.	King Edwards' Inc. ILP	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	29	16	21	Baltimore City	23	DHR
Independent Living	Jumoke, Inc.	Jumoke, Inc. Independent Living Program	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	22	16	20	Baltimore City	21	DHR

Independent Living	The Martin Pollak Project, Inc.	Martin Pollak Independent Living Program	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	30	16	20	Baltimore City	16	DHR
Independent Living	The Martin Pollak Project, Inc.	Martin Pollak Treatment Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	78	0	20	Baltimore City	4	DHR
Independent Living	Transition Living Services, Inc.	Transition Living Services, Inc. CPA	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	23	16	21	Prince George's	21	DHR
Independent Living	The National Center for Children and Families, Inc.	National Center for Children and Families - Futurebound IL Program	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	21	16	21	Montgomery	2	DHR
Independent Living	Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Washington, Inc.	Catholic Charities DC ILP	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	23	16	20	Prince George's	4	DHR
Independent Living	Umbrella Therapeutic Services, Inc.	Umbrella Therapeutic Services, Inc. CPA	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	10	18	20	Prince George's	4	DHR
Independent Living	New Pathways, Inc.	New Pathways -- Independence Plus CPA	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	58	17	20	Baltimore City	44	DHR
Independent Living	Challengers Independent Living, Inc.	Challengers -- Berts Place Too - 3015 Clifton Ave	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	15	19	Baltimore City	1	DHR
Independent Living	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care ILP - Charlotte Hall	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	7	16	21	St. Mary's	3	DHR
LA_CB	OTHER PROVIDERS				0	0	0		59	DHR

RCCP	EBED COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT INC.	EBED COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT INC.		GH	0	0	0	Prince George's	1	DDA
RCCP	SOMERSET COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC.	SOMERSET COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC.		GH	0	0	0	Somerset	1	DDA
RCCP		ARC of Washington County-Foundations - Children's Residential Services (CRS)			0	0	0	Washington	2	DJS
RCCP		Baltimore Adolescent Treatment Guidance Organization, Inc -B.A.T.G.O			0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	DJS
RCCP		Cedar Ridge Ministries - Cedar Ridge - Faith Cottage - Therapeutic Group Home			0	0	0	Washington	5	DJS
RCCP		Cedar Ridge Ministries - Cedar Ridge - Jordan House Group Home			0	0	0	Washington	21	DJS
RCCP		Children's Home Group Home			0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DJS
RCCP		Children's Resources - Shiningtree Childrens' Home			0	0	0	Washington	8	DJS

RCCP		Guide Ft. Washington Therapeutic Group Home			0	0	0	Prince George's	4	DJS
RCCP		Guide- Therapeutic Group Home Baltimore City			0	0	0	Baltimore City	5	DJS
RCCP		Hearts & Homes for Youth - Jump Start Transitional Boy's Home			0	0	0	Prince George's	6	DJS
RCCP		Hearts & Homes for Youth - Kemp Mill Group Home			0	0	0	Montgomery	5	DJS
RCCP		Hearts & Homes for Youth -John C. Tracey Grp Home			0	0	0	Montgomery	4	DJS
RCCP		Hearts & Homes for Youth- Mary's Mount Manor TGH			0	0	0	Anne Arundel	8	DJS
RCCP		Hearts & Homes for Youth-Helen Smith Girls GH			0	0	0	Montgomery	7	DJS
RCCP		Hearts and Homes - Redl House			0	0	0	Montgomery	9	DJS
RCCP		Karma Academy for Boys - Randallstown			0	0	0	Baltimore	7	DJS
RCCP		Kent Youth Boys Group Home			0	0	0	Kent	10	DJS
RCCP		Maple Shade Youth and Family Services, Inc - Mardela Special Care-Ocean Gateway			0	0	0	Wicomico	1	DJS

RCCP		Maryland Sheriff's Youth Ranch. Inc			0	0	0	Frederick	2	DJS
RCCP		Maryland Treatment Center-Chesapeake -The Way Home-Mt Manor			0	0	0	Baltimore City	9	DJS
RCCP		Mosaic -Fordham Cottage			0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DJS
RCCP		National Center for Children and Families-Greentree Adolescent High Intens G. H.			0	0	0	Montgomery	12	DJS
RCCP		NCIA -Youth in Transition Program			0	0	0	Baltimore	16	DJS
RCCP		Oak Hill House-US Fellowship Inc			0	0	0	Washington	13	DJS
RCCP		One Love Group Home - Building Communities Today for Tomorrow			0	0	0	Baltimore City	6	DJS
RCCP		Our House Youth Home			0	0	0	Montgomery	10	DJS
RCCP		Potomac Ridge Crownsville Group Home			0	0	0	Anne Arundel	15	DJS
RCCP		San Mar - Allegany Girls Therapeutic Group Home			0	0	0	Allegany	7	DJS
RCCP		San Mar- Anna Findlay High Intensity Group Home			0	0	0	Washington	9	DJS

RCCP		San Mar Jack E. Barr Therapeutic Group Home			0	0	0	Washington	1	DJS
RCCP		St Ann's Infant And Maternity Program			0	0	0	Prince George's	2	DJS
RCCP		The Board of Child Care - Alternatives for Youth- The Lighthouse Girls TGH			0	0	0	Charles	1	DJS
RCCP		The Board of Child Care - Alternatives for Youth- Triad House - (Boys)TGH.			0	0	0	Calvert	2	DJS
RCCP		The Board of Child Care - Group Home			0	0	0	Baltimore City	3	DJS
RCCP		The Board of Child Care - High Intensity Group Home			0	0	0	Baltimore	13	DJS
RCCP		The Maryland Salem Children's Trust, Inc. Group Home (Western MD)			0	0	0	Allegany	12	DJS
RCCP	Adventist Healthcare, Inc.	Adventist Behavioral Health Cottage At Rockville DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	12	21	Montgomery	8	DHR
RCCP	Adventist Healthcare, Inc.	Adventist Behavioral Health Cottage At North Potomac DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	12	17	Montgomery	7	DHR

RCCP	Arrow Child & Family Ministries of Maryland, Inc.	Arrow Child & Family - Diagnostic Center RCC	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	45	12	18	Baltimore	36	DHR
RCCP	Associated Catholic Charities Inc.	Associated Catholic Charities Villa Maria TGH DHMH	DHMH	RCC: Small Group Home	6	9	14	Baltimore	6	DHR
RCCP	Associated Catholic Charities Inc.	Associated Catholic Charities St Vincents Child Care Center	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	25	3	13	Baltimore	23	DHR
RCCP	The Benedictine School For Exceptional Children, Incorporated	Benedictine -- Benedictine Lane	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	4	5	21	Caroline	10	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care Hagerstown Transitional	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	15	19	Washington	2	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board Of Child Care Colesville Group Home	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	7	7	18	Montgomery	6	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care Main Campus Gaither Rd	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	109	9	20	Baltimore	87	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care Nicodemus	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	15	20	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care Safe Haven	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	9	18	Anne Arundel	3	DHR

RCCP	Brook Lane Health Services, Inc.	Brook Lane - Stone Bridge Transitional Care Respite	DHR	RCC: Respite	19	6	17	Washington	17	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Guild, Inc.	Childrens Guild Kanner House DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	12	18	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Guild, Inc.	Childrens Guild Harford House DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	12	18	Baltimore City	1	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Guild, Inc.	Childrens Guild Debuskey House DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	12	18	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Home, Inc.	The Children's Home Transitional Living	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	8	13	17	Baltimore	6	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Home, Inc.	The Children's Home Long Term Care Group Home	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	48	13	20	Baltimore	36	DHR
RCCP	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - John C. Tracey Boys Group Home	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	13	17	Montgomery	2	DHR
RCCP	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - Helen Smith Girls Group Home	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	13	17	Montgomery	1	DHR
RCCP	Sheppard Pratt Health System, Inc.	Sheppard Pratt High Intensity Adolescent Respite Program	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	24	11	21	Baltimore	5	DHR
RCCP	Starflight Enterprises, Inc.	Starflight Brigadoon Trail	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	15	20	Baltimore	1	DHR

RCCP	Starflight Enterprises, Inc.	Starflight Rocky Brook Ct	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	15	20	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	Williams Life Center, Inc.	Williams Life Center, Inc. - Mason	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	16	20	Prince George's	8	DHR
RCCP	Williams Life Center, Inc.	Williams Life Center, Inc. - Stratford	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	14	18	Prince George's	8	DHR
RCCP	Mosaic Community Services, Inc.	Mosaic Fordham Cottage DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	12	18	Baltimore	5	DHR
RCCP	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - Damamli Independent Living	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	24	18	21	Baltimore	4	DHR
RCCP	The Maryland Salem Children's Trust, Inc.	Maryland Salem Children's Trust, Inc.	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	12	6	18	Allegany	9	DHR
RCCP	Arrow Child & Family Ministries of Maryland, Inc.	Arrow Child & Family - Transitional Living RCC	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	18	13	21	Harford	13	DHR
RCCP	Inspiring Minds Inc.	Inspiring Minds - Gwynn Ave	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	16	20	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	The KOBA Institute, Inc.	KOBA - Mansion at Focus Point Clinton	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	13	17	Prince George's	1	DHR
RCCP	Our House, Inc.	Our House, Inc.- Zion Rd	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	6	16	21	Montgomery	1	DHR

RCCP	Challengers Independent Living, Inc.	Challengers Bert Place	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	16	19	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA 725 Milford Mill	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	17	21	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	Aries Residential Services Incorporated	Aries Residential Services - 2014 Druid Hill	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	15	19	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	Children's Resources, Inc	Children's Resources, Inc - Shining Tree	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	4	13	16	Washington	2	DHR
RCCP	Franklin Group Homes, Incorporated	Franklin Group Homes, Inc - Rosemont	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	13	16	Baltimore City	1	DHR
RCCP	Care With Class, Inc.	Care With Class, Inc. - Apt B2	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	15	19	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	McJoy's Joy Covenant Inc.	McJoy's Joy Covenant - Althea Ave	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	15	18	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	Structures Youth Home, Inc.	Structures Youth Home, Inc. -- 9830 Sodus Manor	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	14	18	Charles	4	DHR
RCCP	Inner-County Outreach Incorporated	Inner-County Outreach - Edgewood	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	14	18	Harford	6	DHR
RCCP	Care With Class, Inc.	Care With Class, Inc. - Apt A3	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	15	19	Baltimore City	3	DHR

RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care Rolling Road	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	15	20	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	King Edwards' Inc.	King Edwards' Inc. ILP	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	29	16	21	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Inc.	The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Inc. TFC Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	45	0	20	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA 4017 Eldorado Ave	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	14	20	Baltimore City	1	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA 1218 Brigadoon Trail	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	17	21	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA 1715 Hartsdale Road	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	14	17	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	Jumoke, Inc.	Jumoke, Inc. Gwynn	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	16	19	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA Shoshone Way	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	17	21	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	Jumoke, Inc.	Jumoke, Inc. Eveshem	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	18	20	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	Sarah's House, Inc.	Sarah's House I -- 2209 Liberty Heights	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	17	20	Baltimore City	6	DHR

RCCP	Sarah's House, Inc.	Sarah's House II - - 2552 McCulloh	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	18	20	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	Aunt Hattie`s Place, Inc.	Aunt Hattie`s Place, Inc. Maine	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	12	15	19	Baltimore City	10	DHR
RCCP	Aunt Hattie`s Place, Inc.	Aunt Hattie's Place, Inc Shenton	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	16	20	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	The Place for Children, Incorporated	Place for Children Vosges	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	12	15	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	The Place for Children, Incorporated	Place for Children 1326 Greenwood	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	13	16	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	Tuttie`s Place	Tuttie's Place 3720 Marmon Avenue	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	9	16	20	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	JS Social Services, Inc	JS Social Services -- Youthtown USA I - 517 Church	DHR	RCC: Shelter Home	4	15	18	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	CONCERN - Professional for Children and Youth, Inc	CONCERN Lanham CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatmen t Foster Care	46	0	20	Prince George's	8	DHR
RCCP	The Place for Children, Incorporated	Place for Children 3670 Hilmar	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	12	15	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	Neighbor to Family, Inc.	Neighbor to Family Sibling Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatmen t Foster Care	83	0	20	Baltimore	1	DHR

RCCP	Making A Great Individual Contribution, Inc.	MAGIC 8 WALDEN PINE	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	13	18	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	All That Matters, Inc.	All That Matters - Rhodena Place	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	16	20	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	Rolling Vista Place Incorporated	Rolling Vista Place - Wyanoke	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	16	20	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	Youth-Vision Services, Inc.	Youth-Vision Services - Crandall	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	16	20	Prince George's	1	DHR
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc.	ARC of Washington County - Jefferson House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	10	17	Washington	4	DHR
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc.	ARC of Washington County - Potomac House - 225 Potomac St	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	15	21	Washington	5	DHR
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc.	ARC of Washington County - Foundations II - 343 S Potomac	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	16	21	Washington	3	DHR
RCCP	The National Center for Children and Families, Inc.	National Center for Children and Families RCC	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	20	12	20	Montgomery	7	DHR
RCCP	F & N Children's Youth Home, Inc.	F & N Children's Youth Home -- Justin Way	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	14	17	Montgomery	4	DHR

RCCP	Compassion Inc.	Compassion, Inc. Oakland	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	16	19	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	Making A Great Individual Contribution, Inc.	MAGIC 9 Walden Oak	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	18	20	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	Making A Great Individual Contribution, Inc.	MAGIC Purnell Drive	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	13	18	Baltimore	4	DHR
RCCP	Day By Day Residential Services, Inc.	Day By Day Residential Services - Oakfield	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	14	18	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	Linwood Center, Inc.	Linwood Center -- North Rogers	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	3	4	21	Howard	3	DHR
RCCP	Franklin Group Homes, Incorporated	Franklin Group Homes, Inc - Lorraine	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	15	18	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	The KOBA Institute, Inc.	KOBA - Mansion at Focus Point Oxon Hill	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	15	20	Prince George's	1	DHR
RCCP	Franklin Group Homes, Incorporated	Franklin Group Homes, Inc - Wild Cherry	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	13	16	Baltimore	4	DHR
RCCP	Maryland Sheriffs' Youth Ranch, Inc.	Maryland Sheriffs' Youth Ranch - Frederick	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	12	10	18	Frederick	6	DHR
RCCP	St. Ann`s Infant and Maternity Home	St. Ann's Infant & Maternity, Inc. Group Home	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	12	0	21	Prince George's	2	DHR

RCCP	San Mar Children`s Home, Inc.	San Mar Children's Home, Inc Group Home	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	7	12	18	Washington	3	DHR
RCCP	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland - 5720 Executive	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	227	0	21	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	The ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc	ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc Benton	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	15	19	Anne Arundel	1	DHR
RCCP	The ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc	ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc Forest View	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	14	20	Anne Arundel	1	DHR
RCCP	LifeLine Inc.	LifeLine 8226 Brushy Ridge 1E	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	3	9	20	Anne Arundel	3	DHR
RCCP	Devine Interventions, Inc.	Devine Intervention - Northwood	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	14	18	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	Hebron Association for Community Services Inc.	Hebron Association - Philomen's Place - - Bauer	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	13	21	Montgomery	5	DHR
RCCP	Center for Social Change, Inc	Center for Social Change MFP Chapman	DDA	RCC: Medically Fragile	5	3	21	Baltimore	5	DHR
RCCP	CIS & H Inc.	CIS & H Inc. Bald Hill	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	10	14	Prince George's	6	DHR
RCCP	First Metropolitan Facilities Inc.	First Metropolitan - 6208 Auth	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	12	16	Prince George's	1	DHR

RCCP	Brotherhood and Sisterhood (BSI) International	Brotherhood and Sisterhood -- Dublin	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	16	19	Montgomery	3	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA Burnwood Avenue	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	17	21	Baltimore City	1	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA Stonewood Road	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	14	17	Baltimore City	1	DHR
RCCP	Changing Lives at Home, Inc.	Changing Lives At Home, Inc.	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	15	19	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family 1010 Nyanga	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	0	21	Prince George's	3	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family 1015 Minna	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	4	0	21	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family - 1009 Minna	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	2	0	21	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	KHI Services, Inc.	KHI, Inc. Karma Academy for Boys Randallstown	DJJ	RCC: Small Group Home	4	14	18	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	San Mar Children's Home, Inc.	San Mar Graff Shelter for Girls	DJJ	RCC: Shelter Home	4	12	18	Washington	2	DHR
RCCP	Transformations, Inc.	Transformations - Windsor	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	10	16	20	Baltimore City	8	DHR
RCCP	Brotherhood and Sisterhood (BSI) International	Brotherhood and Sisterhood -- Ingalls	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	14	18	Prince George's	2	DHR

RCCP	Brotherhood and Sisterhood (BSI) International	Brotherhood and Sisterhood -- Blueridge	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	14	18	Montgomery	2	DHR
RCCP	CIS & H Inc.	CIS & H Inc. Manchester	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	6	15	18	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	CIS & H Inc.	CIS & H Inc. Boykin	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	7	13	16	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	Center for Social Change, Inc	Center for Social Change Springdell	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	9	21	Baltimore	5	DHR
RCCP	First Metropolitan Facilities Inc.	First Metropolitan 6302 Auth Road	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	12	16	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	First Metropolitan Facilities Inc.	First Metropolitan Sydney Avenue	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	4	11	15	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	Hebron Association for Community Services Inc.	Hebron Association - Frankfort Dr.	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	8	18	Montgomery	2	DHR
RCCP	LifeLine Inc.	LifeLine 8226 Brushy Ridge 1A	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	15	19	Anne Arundel	3	DHR
RCCP	LifeLine Inc.	LifeLine 8226 Brushy Ridge 1D	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	14	19	Anne Arundel	3	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family 1006 Minna	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	5	0	21	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family 1008 Nyanga	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	0	21	Prince George's	5	DHR

RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven Vanderlyn	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	3	13	21	Cecil	2	DHR
RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven Short Cut	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	4	13	21	Cecil	4	DHR
RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven Pine Valley	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	2	13	21	Cecil	2	DHR
RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven Park Towne	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	3	6	16	Cecil	2	DHR
RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven Mary Anita	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	13	21	Cecil	2	DHR
RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven 108 Continental	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	4	13	21	Cecil	4	DHR
RCCP	Cedar Ridge Children's Home and School, Inc.	Cedar Ridge Children's Home DHMH	DHMH	RCC: Small Group Home	6	11	17	Washington	2	DHR
RCCP	GUIDE Program, Inc.	GUIDE Barrington DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	6	13	18	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	Mosaic Community Services, Inc.	Mosaic Dulaney House DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	12	18	Howard	4	DHR
RCCP	San Mar Children's Home, Inc.	San Mar Jack E Barr DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	13	18	Washington	7	DHR
RCCP	Maple Shade Youth and Family Services, Inc.	Maple Shade Mardela Special Care DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	6	8	18	Wicomico	4	DHR

RCCP	Inner-County Outreach Incorporated	Inner-County Outreach - Overlea	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	16	20	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	Trimir Home for Children and Families, Inc.	Trimir Home for Children and Families - Westview Lane	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	15	19	Prince George's	1	DHR
RCCP	Goliven Group Home, Inc.	Goliven Group Homes - St. Georges	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	16	20	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	Knowledge Empowers You to Succeed, Inc.	Knowledge Empowers You to Succeed - Premiere House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	17	20	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	Starrs Group Home, Inc.	Starrs Group Home -- Maine	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	17	20	Baltimore	6	DHR
RCCP	JS Social Services, Inc	JS Social Services - Youthtown USA II - 12 Second	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	13	16	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	Youth Enterprises Services, Inc.	Youth Enterprises Services, Inc. -- Gwynn Oak House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	16	20	Baltimore City	7	DHR
RCCP	Youth Enterprises Services, Inc.	Youth Enterprises Services Inc -- Lincoln House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	16	20	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc.	ARC of Washington County - Bridgewater	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	10	17	Washington	4	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Home, Inc.	The Children's Home -- Diagnostic & Treatment	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	16	0	21	Baltimore	6	DHR

RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family -- 14101 Lancaster Lane	DDA	Alternati ve Living Unit	5	0	11	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	The KOBA Institute, Inc.	KOBA - Mansion at Focus Point Silver Spring	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	13	20	Montgomery	3	DHR
RCCP	All That Matters, Inc. Foundation	All That Matters Foundation -- Chalfont	DHMH	Therapeu tic Group Home	6	13	17	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	All That Matters, Inc. Foundation	All That Matters Foundation -- Bellgreen	DHMH	Therapeu tic Group Home	8	13	17	Prince George's	8	DHR
RCCP	Jumoke, Inc.	Jumoke, Inc. 33rd Street	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	17	20	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	Our Fortress Homes, Inc.	Our Fortress Homes -- Hilton DHMH	DHMH	Therapeu tic Group Home	8	14	18	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	We Are The World, Inc.	We Are The World -- Woodbine	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	13	17	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	Structures Youth Home, Inc.	Structures Youth Home -- 9840 Sodus Manor	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	7	14	18	Charles	7	DHR
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc.	ARC of Washington County -12828 St. Paul Road	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	10	17	Washington	4	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA St. Andrews	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	2	15	19	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	New Pathways, Inc.	New Pathways -- Second Generations CPA	DHR	CPA: Independ ent Living	24	16	21	Baltimore City	22	DHR

RCCP	LifeLine Inc.	LifeLine 8224 Brushy Ridge 1F	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	1	14	20	Anne Arundel	2	DHR
RCCP	Tuttie's Place	Tuttie's Place -- 3013 Chelsea Terrace	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	16	16	21	Baltimore City	15	DHR
RCCP	Tender Care	Tender Care - 27905 Ocean Gateway	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	5	13	18	Wicomico	3	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family - 15206 Old Chapel Road	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	0	21	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	Compassion Inc.	Compassion - 3934 Frisby Ave	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	0	0	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	Challengers Independent Living, Inc.	Challengers -- Berts Place Too - 3015 Clifton Ave	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	15	19	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	Mercy Family Care, Inc.	Mercy Family Care -- Sutton Court	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	14	17	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	Woodbourne Center, Inc.	Woodbourne Center - Diagnostic	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	16	12	17	Baltimore City	7	DHR
RCCP	KidsPeace National Centers of North America, Inc.	Kidspace CPA - Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	40	0	21	Baltimore City	1	DHR
RCCP	Community Services for Autistic Adults and Children, Inc.	CSAAC 18325 Queen Elizabeth Drive	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	1	0	21	Montgomery	1	DHR

RCCP	Aunt Hattie`s Place, Inc.	Aunt Hattie's Place, Inc. Norwood Rd	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	8	13	17	Montgomery	6	DHR
RCCP	Head Injury Rehabilitation & Referral Services, Inc	Head Injury Rehab. & Ref. Srvs - 9800 Leatherfern	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	1	18	20	Montgomery	1	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care - DHMH TGH Waldorf	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	6	12	17	Charles	5	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care - DHMH TGH Prince Frederick	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	12	17	Calvert	4	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family - 14110 Lancaster	DDA	RCC: Medically Fragile	5	0	20	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family - Crosswick	DDA	RCC: Medically Fragile	5	0	20	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	Brook Lane Health Services, Inc.	Brook Lane - Residential Group Home	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	8	13	18	Washington	1	DHR
RCCP	LifeLine Inc.	LifeLine 8224 Brushy Ridge #1A DHMH DDA	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	0	20	Anne Arundel	2	DHR
RCCP	Community Services for Autistic Adults and Children, Inc.	CSAAC Dairyton	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	1	0	20	Montgomery	1	DHR
RCCP	Dove Pointe Residential Services, Inc.	Dove Pointe - Jerome	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	1	0	20	Wicomico	1	DHR
RCCP	Dove Pointe Residential Services, Inc.	Dove Pointe - Aspen	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	1	0	20	Wicomico	1	DHR

Non-Community Based Residential Placements

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Who Reported
ASAM	The W House, Inc.	W House	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Washington	1	ADAA
ASAM	Gale Houses, Inc.	Gale House	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Frederick	1	ADAA
ASAM	Howard County Health Dept.	Howard County Halfway House	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Howard	2	ADAA
ASAM	Recovery Network	Recovery Network	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	ADAA
ASAM	Right Turn of MD	Right Turn of MD	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	ADAA
ASAM	Allegany County Health Dept.	Allegany House	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Allegany	1	ADAA
ASAM	Avery House	Avery House	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	ADAA
ASAM	Powell Recovery Center	South Broadway	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Baltimore City	2	ADAA
ASAM	Second Genesis, Inc.	Second Genesis Crownsville	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	ADAA
ASAM	Gaudenzia	Gaudenzia Park Heights	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	ADAA
ASAM	Gaudenzia	Gaudenzia Owings Mills	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Baltimore	8	ADAA
ASAM	The Carol M. Porto Treatment Center	Carol M. Porto Treatment Center	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Calvert	1	ADAA
ASAM	Chrysalis House, Inc.	Chrysalis House	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	ADAA
ASAM	Mountain Manor	Safe Harbor	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Frederick	2	ADAA
ASAM	Washington County Health Dept	Cameo House	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Washington	1	ADAA
ASAM	Mountain Manor	New Horizons	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Frederick	2	ADAA
ASAM	Baltimore Station	South Baltimore	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	ADAA
ASAM	Right Turn of Maryland	K Building	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Baltimore	5	ADAA
ASAM	Gaudenzia	Gaudenzia Park Heights	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	ADAA

ASAM	Gaudenzia	Gaudenzia at Woodland	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	ADAA
ASAM	Washington County Health Dept.	Catoctin Summit	OHCQ	General	0	0	17	Frederick	17	ADAA
ASAM	Mountain Manor	New Horizons	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Frederick	1	ADAA
ASAM	Second Genesis	MCIW	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	ADAA
ASAM	Gaudenzia	Gaudenzia Owings Mills	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Baltimore	1	ADAA
ASAM	Addictions Recovery, Inc.	Hope House	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	5	ADAA
ASAM	Avery Road Treatment Center	Avery Road	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Montgomery	5	ADAA
ASAM	Kent County Health Dept.	A.F. Whitsitt Center	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Kent	6	ADAA
ASAM	Walden Sierra, Inc.	Walden Sierra	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	St. Mary's	2	ADAA
ASAM	Allegany County Health Dept.	Massie Unit	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Allegany	2	ADAA
ASAM	Allegany County Health Dept.	Jackson Unit	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Allegany	40	ADAA
ASAM	Warwick Manor Behavioral Health, Inc.	Warwick Manor	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Dorchester	3	ADAA
ASAM	Mountain Manor Treatment	Mountain Manor	OHCQ	General	0	0	17	Baltimore	50	ADAA
ASAM	Mountain Manor	Mountain Manor Treatment Center	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Frederick	1	ADAA
ASAM	Avery Road Treatment Center	Avery Road	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	ADAA
ASAM	Anne Arundel Medical Center	Pathways	OHCQ	General	0	0	17	Anne Arundel	2	ADAA
ASAM	Mountain Manor Treatment	Mountain Manor	OHCQ	General	0	0	17	Baltimore	6	ADAA
ASAM	Mountain Manor	Mountain Manor Treatment Center	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Frederick	1	ADAA
ASAM	Baltimore Crisis Response	East North Ave	OHCQ	General	0	0	0	Baltimore City	1	ADAA
ASAM		Catoctin Summit Adol. Prog.			0	0	0	Frederick	12	DJS

ASAM		Lois E. Jackson Unit-Addictions Program			0	0	0	Allegany	16	DJS
ASAM		Maryland Treatment Center - Mountain Manor Drug Treatment Center			0	0	0	Baltimore City	12	DJS
ASAM		Meadow Mountain Youth Center			0	0	0	Garrett	40	DJS
ASAM		Morning Star Youth Academy			0	0	0	Dorchester	30	DJS
ASAM		Rite of Passage - Silver Oak Academy			0	0	0	Carroll	48	DJS
ASAM		William Donald Schaefer House			0	0	0	Baltimore City	15	DJS
Detention		Backbone Mountain Youth Center			0	0	0	Garrett	48	DJS
Detention		Green Ridge - Mountain Quest			0	0	0	Allegany	10	DJS
Detention		Green Ridge Youth Center			0	0	0	Allegany	29	DJS
Detention		Savage Mountain Youth Center			0	0	0	Allegany	36	DJS
Detention		Victor Cullen Center			0	0	0	Frederick	37	DJS
DETP		Arrow Child and Family Ministries - Diagnostic Center			0	0	0	Baltimore	7	DJS
DETP		RICA - Rockville CEU Diagnostic			0	0	0	Montgomery	3	DJS
DETP		Woodbourne Children Diag Treat Center - CEU			0	0	0	Baltimore	4	DJS

LA_NCB	OTHER PROVIDERS				0	0	0		106	DHR
NonSecure		J. DeWeese Carter Youth Facility Young Women's Hardware Secure Program			0	0	0	Kent	7	DJS
Res Education	Associated Catholic Charities, Inc.	Villa Maria School			0	0	0	Baltimore	1	MSDE
Res Education	Community Services for Autistic Adults and Children, Inc.	Community School of Maryland			0	0	0	Montgomery	8	MSDE
Res Education	Community Support Services, Inc.	Marcia D. Smith School			0	0	0	Montgomery	2	MSDE
Res Education	Linwood Center, Inc.	Linwood Center, Inc.			0	0	0	Howard	6	MSDE
Res Education	Sheppard Pratt Health System, Inc.	Jefferson School, The			0	0	0	Frederick	3	MSDE
Res Education	Shorehaven, Inc.	Shorehaven School			0	0	0	Cecil	6	MSDE
Res Education	The Benedictine School for Exceptional Children, Inc.	Benedictine School, The			0	0	0	Caroline	18	MSDE
RTC		Good Shepherd Center -Females Program			0	0	0	Baltimore	22	DJS
RTC		Good Shepherd Center Males Program			0	0	0	Baltimore	9	DJS
RTC		Jefferson School			0	0	0	Frederick	18	DJS
RTC		New Directions Chesapeake Treatment Center-Hickey			0	0	0	Baltimore	19	DJS

RTC		Potomac Ridge Behavioral Health- Anne Arundel			0	0	0	Anne Arundel	11	DJS
RTC		Potomac Ridge Behavioral Health -Eastern Shore			0	0	0	Dorchester	13	DJS
RTC		Potomac Ridge Residential Treatment Center			0	0	0	Montgomery	8	DJS
RTC		RICA - Rockville RTC			0	0	0	Montgomery	1	DJS
RTC		RICA- Baltimore Residential Treatment Center			0	0	0	Baltimore City	4	DJS
RTC		Sheppard Pratt Towson MANN RTC			0	0	0	Baltimore	2	DJS
RTC		Villa Maria Residential Treatment Center			0	0	0	Baltimore	1	DJS
RTC		Woodbourne Residential Treatment Center			0	0	0	Baltimore City	29	DJS
RTC	Rica -Regional Institute For Children & Adolescents	RICA Baltimore RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	45	0	21	Baltimore City	21	DHR
RTC	Rica -Regional Institute For Children & Adolescents	RICA Rockville RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	80	0	21	Montgomery	2	DHR
RTC	Associated Catholic Charities Inc.	Associated Catholic Charities -- St Vincent's Villa (Pot Spring) RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	52	0	20	Baltimore	37	DHR

RTC	Adventist Healthcare, Inc.	Adventist Behavioral Health Anne Arundel RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	18	0	20	Anne Arundel	10	DHR
RTC	Adventist Healthcare, Inc.	Adventist Behavioral Health Eastern Shore RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	14	0	20	Dorchester	2	DHR
RTC	Adventist Healthcare, Inc.	Adventist Behavioral Health Rockville RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	49	0	20	Montgomery	9	DHR
RTC	Sheppard Pratt Health System, Inc.	Sheppard Pratt Berkeley & Eleanor Mann RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	48	12	20	Baltimore	41	DHR
RTC	Good Shepherd Center	Good Shepherd Center RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	105	0	20	Baltimore	37	DHR
RTC	Sheppard Pratt Health System, Inc.	Sheppard Pratt -- The Jefferson School RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	53	12	20	Frederick	20	DHR
RTC	Woodbourne Center, Inc.	Woodbourne Center RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	48	0	20	Baltimore City	10	DHR

Hospitalizations

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Who Reported
In Patient	OTHER PROVIDERS				0	0	0		5	DHR
Psych		Spring Grove Hospital Center			0	0	0	Baltimore	7	DJS
Psych	OTHER PROVIDERS				0	0	0		6	DHR

Unknown

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Who Reported
Unknown	OTHER PROVIDERS				0	0	0		301	DHR

APPENDIX 2: Placement by Jurisdiction by Placement Subcategory

Family Home, Adoptive

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from Jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																											
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown		
Allegany	5	10.6%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0		
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore City	5	10.6%	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1		
Calvert	8	17.0%	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	6	12.8%	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	1	2.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	4	8.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	2	4.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	3	6.4%	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	2	4.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0		
Harford	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howard	1	2.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	1	2.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Queen Anne's	1	2.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	1	2.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	2	4.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	2	4.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	1	2.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Worcester	2	4.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	47	100.0%	3	2	0	2	7	6	1	0	4	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	3	1	0	7	1	1	
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	87.5%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			6.4%	4.3%	0.0%	4.3%	14.9%	12.8%	2.1%	0.0%	8.5%	4.3%	4.3%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	6.4%	0.0%	6.4%	2.1%	0.0%	14.9%	2.1%	2.1%	

Family Home, Foster Care

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placements	% of children statewide in placements from Jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																									
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	38	2.9%	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0
Anne Arundel	64	4.8%	0	57	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
Baltimore	96	7.2%	0	1	78	8	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Baltimore City	440	33.2%	0	6	92	316	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	
Calvert	25	1.9%	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	16	1.2%	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	
Carroll	20	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	59	4.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Charles	35	2.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Dorchester	3	0.2%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	40	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	18	1.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	79	6.0%	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howard	14	1.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	100	7.5%	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	93	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	88	6.6%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	1	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	
Queen Anne's	4	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	15	1.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	40	3.0%	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	
Talbot	8	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	4	0		
Washington	95	7.2%	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	0	0	0	0		
Wicomico	11	0.8%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	2	0		
Worcester	19	1.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	1	0		
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Grand Total	1327	100.0%	34	66	175	329	23	16	20	59	36	2	43	18	82	28	1	96	84	3	3	31	3	98	28	13	34	
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			89.5%	89.1%	81.3%	71.8%	88.0%	81.3%	90.0%	98.3%	94.3%	66.7%	92.5%	94.4%	94.9%	100.0%	0.0%	93.0%	85.2%	75.0%	20.0%	77.5%	37.5%	97.9%	72.7%	47.4%	0.0%	
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			2.6%	5.0%	13.2%	24.8%	1.7%	1.2%	1.5%	4.4%	2.7%	0.2%	3.2%	1.4%	6.2%	2.1%	0.1%	7.2%	6.3%	0.2%	0.2%	2.3%	0.2%	7.4%	2.1%	1.0%	2.6%	

Family Home, Relative Care

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																										
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	18	1.5%	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Anne Arundel	20	1.7%	0	14	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Baltimore	50	4.1%	0	0	29	14	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Baltimore City	773	64.0%	0	18	79	605	0	2	2	3	2	0	2	0	17	6	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	19	
Calvert	18	1.5%	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	2	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	16	1.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Charles	15	1.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	
Dorchester	2	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	30	2.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	
Garrett	4	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Harford	31	2.6%	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Howard	7	0.6%	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	2	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	101	8.4%	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	54	4.5%	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	4	37	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	4	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	
St. Mary's	37	3.1%	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Talbot	3	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	18	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	1	0	
Wicomico	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Worcester	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	1207	100.0%	16	38	114	626	15	2	6	26	16	3	25	5	37	12	1	82	59	1	1	32	2	22	2	1	23	38	
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			88.9%	70.0%	58.0%	78.3%	55.6%	0.0%	100.0%	87.5%	66.7%	100.0%	60.0%	75.0%	58.1%	28.6%	50.0%	77.2%	68.5%	0.0%	25.0%	73.0%	66.7%	88.9%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			1.3%	3.1%	9.4%	51.9%	1.2%	0.2%	0.5%	2.2%	1.3%	0.2%	2.1%	0.4%	3.1%	1.0%	0.1%	6.8%	4.9%	0.1%	0.1%	2.7%	0.2%	1.8%	0.2%	0.1%	1.9%	3.1%	

Family Home, Restricted Relative Care

		Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																										
Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements From Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	2	0.4%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	27	5.5%	0	2	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Baltimore City	376	76.6%	0	11	72	244	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	5	6	0	1	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	22	1
Calvert	6	1.2%	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	3	0.6%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	9	1.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Garrett	2	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	5	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	1	0.2%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	22	4.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	13	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0
Prince George's	18	3.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	5	1.0%	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	15	3.1%	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	491	100.0%	0	14	89	253	7	1	5	3	4	0	9	2	10	8	0	14	27	0	0	6	0	13	0	0	25	1
% of children from jurisdiction placed in			0.0%	50.0%	44.4%	64.9%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	88.9%	100.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	59.1%	94.4%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	73.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	2.9%	18.1%	51.5%	1.4%	0.2%	1.0%	0.6%	0.8%	0.0%	1.8%	0.4%	2.0%	1.6%	0.0%	2.9%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	0.2%

Family Home, TFC

Home Jurisdiction of Children	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	6	9.0%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	
Anne Arundel	26	38.8%	0	10	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Baltimore	182	271.6%	0	11	90	45	0	0	4	2	1	1	0	0	14	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	
Baltimore City	1122	1674.6%	0	37	459	481	0	0	8	3	7	3	0	0	27	20	0	3	62	0	1	0	0	4	2	0	1	4	
Calvert	10	14.9%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	7	10.4%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	
Carroll	2	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	21	31.3%	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	7	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	
Charles	16	23.9%	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	6	9.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	
Frederick	20	29.9%	1	1	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	5	7.5%	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	46	68.7%	0	1	7	10	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howard	13	19.4%	0	1	5	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	2	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	100	149.3%	1	6	16	5	0	3	0	2	0	1	0	2	3	0	37	13	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	1	1		
Prince George's	241	359.7%	1	13	6	9	5	0	2	0	11	0	0	1	8	0	7	174	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Queen Anne's	4	6.0%	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	20	29.9%	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	7	2	0	0		
St. Mary's	48	71.6%	0	2	2	4	1	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	9	13.4%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	0		
Washington	32	47.8%	5	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0		
Wicomico	26	38.8%	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	10	0	6	0	0	0		
Worcester	16	23.9%	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	5	0	0	0		
OOS	1	1.5%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Grand Total	67	296.7%	8	19	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	15	2	10	0	0	0		
% of children from jurisdiction placed in			50.0%	38.5%	49.5%	42.9%	10.0%	14.3%	50.0%	33.3%	25.0%	16.7%	5.0%	40.0%	43.5%	15.4%	100.0%	37.0%	72.2%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	11.1%	53.1%	23.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			11.9%	28.4%	13.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.4%	3.0%	14.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	

Family Home, Composite

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																									
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	10	3.3%	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Anne Arundel	4	1.3%	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	44	14.4%	0	3	6	21	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	6	
Baltimore City	108	35.3%	0	0	3	87	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	
Calvert	2	0.7%	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	6	2.0%	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	10	3.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	2	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	6	2.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	
Garrett	4	1.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Harford	17	5.6%	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Howard	7	2.3%	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	31	10.1%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Prince George's	18	5.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Queen Anne's	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	3	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Washington	24	7.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	2	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	
Worcester	3	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	306	100.0%	9	6	15	112	2	2	7	14	2	3	5	2	8	4	0	24	17	1	1	0	1	27	2	2	38	
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			90.0%	75.0%	13.6%	80.6%	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%	35.3%	28.6%	0.0%	74.2%	88.9%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	95.8%	100.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			2.9%	2.0%	4.9%	36.6%	0.7%	0.7%	2.3%	4.6%	0.7%	1.0%	1.6%	0.7%	2.6%	1.3%	0.0%	7.8%	5.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	8.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	12.4%

Family Home, Living Arrangement

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																									
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Community, Independent Living

Home Jurisdiction of Children	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carrall	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	5	2.3%	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	17	8.0%	0	0	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	125	58.7%	0	0	47	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carrall	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	2	0.9%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	5	2.3%	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	1	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	1	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	4	1.9%	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	3	1.4%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	22	10.3%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	22	10.3%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	2	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	2	0.9%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	1	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	1	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	213	100.0%	0	0	74	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	23	29	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of children from jurisdiction placed in			0.0%	0.0%	82.4%	59.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	68.2%	81.8%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	34.7%	38.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%	13.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Community, RCCP

		Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																											
	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Home Jurisdiction of Children																													
Allegany	13	1.2%	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	49	4.4%	1	7	12	5	0	1	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	0
Baltimore	130	11.7%	2	2	62	27	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	6	1	
Baltimore City	343	31.0%	2	5	97	154	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	19	41	0	0	0	0	7	2	0	8	1	
Calvert	11	1.0%	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	4	0.4%	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	17	1.5%	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	20	1.8%	0	1	9	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Charles	20	1.8%	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	
Dorchester	8	0.7%	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Frederick	28	2.5%	1	0	4	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	1	0	
Garrett	12	1.1%	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	
Harford	59	5.3%	1	1	25	5	0	3	0	4	1	0	0	0	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	3	0		
Howard	20	1.8%	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	1	0	
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	97	8.8%	1	5	20	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	40	6	0	0	0	0	12	2	0	2	1	
Prince George's	175	15.8%	2	14	33	14	0	2	0	2	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	21	52	0	0	0	0	25	1	0	3	1	
Queen Anne's	4	0.4%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Somerset	4	0.4%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	21	1.9%	0	0	4	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Talbot	3	0.3%	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	42	3.8%	4	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	29	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	20	1.8%	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	2	0	
Worcester	4	0.4%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
OOS	4	0.4%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	1108	100.0%	28	37	309	220	6	10	0	16	17	0	8	0	19	11	10	108	131	0	0	0	0	120	14	0	38	6	
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			46.2%	14.3%	47.7%	44.9%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	30.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	16.9%	5.0%	0.0%	41.2%	29.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	69.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			2.5%	3.3%	27.9%	19.9%	0.5%	0.9%	0.0%	1.4%	1.5%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	1.7%	1.0%	0.9%	9.7%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%	1.3%	0.0%	3.4%	0.5%	

Community, CSLA

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																									
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	2	2.4%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	3	3.6%	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	13	15.5%	0	0	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	7	8.3%	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	1	1.2%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	2	2.4%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	7	8.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	1	1.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	2	2.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	1	1.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	1	1.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	4	4.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	29	34.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	5	6.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	1	1.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	1	1.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	3	3.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	1	1.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	84	100.0%	2	3	14	6	1	2	7	1	2	1	0	1	4	0	29	5	1	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			100.0%	100.0%	84.6%	57.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			2.4%	3.6%	16.7%	7.1%	1.2%	2.4%	8.3%	1.2%	2.4%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	4.8%	0.0%	34.5%	6.0%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	3.6%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Community, Composite Community-Based

Home Jurisdiction of Children	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	7	11.7%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Baltimore City	35	58.3%	3	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	11	18.3%	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Prince George's	5	8.3%	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	1	1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	1	1.7%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	60	100.0%	5	0	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	0	7	0	0	1	2	0	1	14	
% of children from jurisdiction placed in			0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	17.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.2%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			8.3%	0.0%	20.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	3.3%	6.7%	0.0%	11.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	3.3%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	23.3%	

Community, Living Arrangement

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children state wide in placements from Jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																								
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Non-Community, DETP

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																									
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	1	7.1%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	1	7.1%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	2	14.3%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	1	7.1%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	3	21.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	2	14.3%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	3	21.4%	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	1	7.1%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	14	100.0%	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	78.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Non-Community, Detention

		Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																											
Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children state wide in placements from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	6	3.8%	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	11	6.9%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	7	4.4%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	34	21.3%	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	8	5.0%	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	2	1.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	2	1.3%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	7	4.4%	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	2	1.3%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	1	0.6%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	3	1.9%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	21	13.1%	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	34	21.3%	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	2	1.3%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	2	1.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	9	5.6%	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	6	3.8%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	2	1.3%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	1	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	160	100.0%	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction (total)			46.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	23.1%	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Non-Community, Non-Secure

		Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																											
Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children state wide in placements from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Anne Arundel	2	4.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Baltimore	5	11.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Baltimore City	12	26.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	1	2.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Cecil	1	2.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	1	2.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	1	2.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	3	6.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Prince George's	13	28.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	1	2.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	1	2.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OOS	4	8.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	45	100.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	0	
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	84.4%	0.0%

Non-Community, Residential Education

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children state wide in placements from jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																										
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	1	1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Anne Arundel	2	3.4%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Baltimore	6	10.3%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Baltimore City	5	8.6%	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	2	3.4%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Carroll	1	1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	1	1.7%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	1	1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	4	6.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	3	5.2%	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	1	1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	2	3.4%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	20	34.5%	0	0	0	0	6	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	
Prince George's	9	15.5%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	58	100.0%	0	0	0	0	18	0	6	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.0%	0.0%	10.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	17.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	34.5%	0.0%

Non-Community, RTC

Home Jurisdiction of Children	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	13	1.8%	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	53	7.4%	0	17	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Baltimore	170	23.6%	0	2	32	128	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Baltimore City	123	17.1%	0	2	45	53	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	
Calvert	8	1.1%	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Caroline	4	0.6%	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	5	0.7%	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	21	2.9%	0	0	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	7	1.0%	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Dorchester	9	1.3%	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	63	8.8%	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	6	0.8%	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	20	2.8%	0	1	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Howard	20	2.8%	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	1	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	78	10.8%	0	1	20	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	
Prince George's	41	5.7%	0	6	17	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Queen Anne's	3	0.4%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	5	0.7%	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	13	1.8%	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	3	0.4%	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	16	2.2%	0	1	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Wicomico	23	3.2%	0	6	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Worcester	7	1.0%	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OOS	7	1.0%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	719	100.0%	0	43	183	284	0	0	0	0	0	28	87	0	0	0	0	65	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	1	
% of children from jurisdiction placed in			0.0%	32.1%	18.8%	43.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	69.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	52.6%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	71.4%	0.0%	
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	6.0%	25.5%	39.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	12.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	0.1%	

Non-Community, ASAM

Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																									
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	8	1.9%	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	41	9.6%	4	5	10	4	0	0	6	0	0	2	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Baltimore	53	12.4%	8	0	15	3	0	0	6	0	0	4	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Baltimore City	107	24.9%	3	1	15	12	0	0	15	0	0	9	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Calvert	11	2.6%	3	1	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	4	0.9%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	11	2.6%	5	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	9	2.1%	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	14	3.3%	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Dorchester	4	0.9%	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	10	2.3%	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	15	3.5%	5	1	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	9	2.1%	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Kent	5	1.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	23	5.4%	5	0	3	4	0	0	2	0	0	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Prince George's	40	9.3%	0	0	2	4	1	0	10	0	0	6	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Queen Anne's	7	1.6%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	1	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	6	1.4%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Talbot	3	0.7%	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	8	1.9%	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	16	3.7%	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	24	5.6%	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	429	100.0%	59	10	71	35	1	0	48	0	0	33	37	40	0	2	6	7	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	76
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			37.5%	12.2%	28.3%	11.2%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			13.8%	2.3%	16.6%	8.2%	0.2%	0.0%	11.2%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	8.6%	9.3%	0.0%	0.5%	1.4%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	17.7%	0.0%

Non-Community, Composite

		Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																											
Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Anne Arundel	1	0.9%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	3	2.8%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Baltimore City	79	74.5%	0	0	6	39	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	19
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	2	1.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	1	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	4	3.8%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Howard	1	0.9%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	3	2.8%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	9	8.5%	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	2	1.9%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	106	100.0%	1	0	9	44	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	1	3	0	3	3	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	24	
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	49.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			0.9%	0.0%	8.5%	41.5%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	3.8%	0.9%	2.8%	0.0%	2.8%	2.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.6%	

Hospitalization, Psychiatric

Home Jurisdiction of Children	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	1	7.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Anne Arundel	1	7.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	2	15.4%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	1	7.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	1	7.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	1	7.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	3	23.1%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	1	7.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	2	15.4%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	13	100.0%	0	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	61.5%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%

Hospitalization, General

Home Jurisdiction of Children	Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																											
	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	3	60.0%	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	1	20.0%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	1	20.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Prince George's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	5	100.0%	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
% of children from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%

Unknown

		Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																										
Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children statewide in placements from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	1	0.3%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	5	1.7%	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Baltimore	14	4.6%	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	7
Baltimore City	233	77.2%	0	2	9	85	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
Calvert	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Charles	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	4	1.3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Harford	4	1.3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	8	2.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Prince George's	23	7.6%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	2	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	302	100.0%	1	5	12	89	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	0	4	1	1	3	13	0	4	1	0	1	2	0	1	156
% of children from jurisdiction placed in			100.0%	40.0%	14.3%	36.5%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	75.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%	25.0%	43.5%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children statewide in all placed in jurisdiction			0.3%	1.7%	4.0%	29.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	0.3%	0.3%	1.0%	4.3%	0.0%	1.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.3%	51.7%