



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

---

---

**FY2014 State of Maryland Out-of-Home Placement  
and Family Preservation Resource Plan**

Submitted by the  
**Governor's Office for Children**  
*On behalf of the Children's Cabinet*

December 12, 2014

## Acknowledgements

---

The following individuals and agencies provided invaluable assistance with this report:

### **Department of Health and Mental Hygiene**

From the newly named Behavioral Health Administration:

Susan Bradley, Mental Hygiene Administration

Eric English, Mental Hygiene Administration

Ceres Martin, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration

Tom Merrick, Mental Hygiene Administration

William Rusinko, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration

### **Governor's Office for Children**

Anne Sheridan, Executive Director

Patricia E. Arriaza, Interagency Initiatives

Deborah Donohue, Principal Counsel

Dan Feller, Finance and Operations

Kim Malat, Grant and Contract Administration

Alem Bayou, SCYFIS Database Manager

Christina Church, Interagency Initiatives

Mark Scott, Interagency Initiatives

### **Department of Human Resources**

Debbie Ramelmeier, Social Services Administration

David Ayer, Social Services Administration

Linda Carter, Social Services Administration

Terry Shaw, University of Maryland School of Social Work

### **Maryland State Department of Education**

Cynthia Amirault, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Richard Baker, Division of Business Services

Jeff Miller, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

### **Department of Juvenile Services**

Michael Ito, Behavioral Health and Victim Services

Michael DiBattista, Fiscal Planning and Management

William Drollinger, Fiscal Planning and Management

John Irvine, Research and Evaluation

Lakshmi Iyengar, Research and Evaluation

Falguni Patel, Research and Evaluation

### **University of Maryland School of Social Work**

Michelle Zabel, Institute for Innovation and Implementation

John Cosgrove, Institute for Innovation and Implementation

Mark Lardner, Institute for Innovation and Implementation

For further information or copies of this report, please visit the Governor's Office for Children's website at [www.goc.maryland.gov](http://www.goc.maryland.gov).

## Table of Contents

---

---

Acknowledgements .....	ii
Introduction & Overview .....	4
Data Collection Methodology, Definitions, and Considerations .....	5
Report Overview .....	9
Organization of the Report .....	12
Statewide Summary .....	13
Department of Human Resources (DHR) Summary .....	24
Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) Summary .....	43
Developmental Disabilities Administration (DDA) Summary .....	
Behavioral Health Administration (BHA) Summary .....	66
Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) Summary .....	
Maryland School for the Blind and School for the Deaf .....	85
Family Preservation Services .....	86
APPENDIX: Placement by Jurisdiction .....	

## Introduction & Overview

---

The State is responsible for linking children 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 costs associated with out-of-home placements, 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 [(Residential Child Care Programs)]" and the 2014 Joint Chairmen's Report requesting an evaluation of "Maryland's family preservation programs in stemming the flow of children from their homes."

The purpose for the Report is to document what is driving placement decisions in Maryland, identify children's needs in Maryland, and describe how the agencies plan to meet those needs. The Report contains information as reported 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). In the Report, these agencies summarize notable details about their out-of-home placements, based on common data elements, and may elaborate on other data presented in the Addendum of each agency's section.

In Maryland, children enter out-of-home care for a variety of reasons and under a number of 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) under 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 other avenue. The State child-serving agencies and administrations responsible for placing children in out-of-home placements are DHR; DJS; and DHMH, including the Developmental Disabilities Administration (DDA) and the Behavioral Health Administration [which recently combined the former Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration (ADAA) and 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. 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 State's local jurisdictions - the local Department of Social Services (LDSS), the local Core Service Agencies (CSAs)<sup>1</sup>, 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 (Baltimore City, and Anne Arundel, 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, Definitions, and Considerations**

---

The data in this Report is aggregate data submitted by each agency for the fiscal years, and the one-day census for each fiscal year. Each agency was given a data request guide along with data collection templates for data reporting and clarification of the information request. GOC also worked individually with each agency to ensure a thorough understanding of reporting requirements and identification of each agency's unique placement process and data collection methods.

---

<sup>1</sup> One Core Service Agency located on the Eastern Shore serves five local jurisdictions.

## Methodology

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

### Reporting Period

This Report features tables and graphs derived from two data sources – “full fiscal year” data and “one-day census” data. This Report differentiates tables using fiscal year data with a shaded 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:

FY2010: July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010

FY2011: July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011

FY2012: July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012

FY2013: July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013

FY2014: July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014

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

FY2010: January 31, 2010

FY2011: January 31, 2011

FY2012: January 31, 2012

FY2013: January 31, 2013

FY2014: January 31, 2014

### Age Group

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

### Race

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

## Definitions

- *“Bed-Day”* - A unit of measurement that refers to a single day in which one child is provided placement in any out-of-home placement.
- *“Children/Youth”* - The term “youth” is used interchangeably with the term “child” but is often used to describe older adolescents or individuals age 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 21<sup>st</sup> birthday.
- *“One-Day Census”* - The measurement of total population on one day out of the year. January 31<sup>st</sup> is consistently used because it is about halfway through the State fiscal year. This measurement is used to gauge the total serving capacity of placements on a comparable, specific, single day.
- *“Population Flow”* - The total number of placements at the 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 geographic population.
- *“Total Served”* – The number of placements at the start of the fiscal year in addition to the number of new placements added during the fiscal year. The placements are counted, and not the number of children, because one child can be placed in more than one category, jurisdiction, or agency in one year. The “total served” encompasses children who may have been placed since the previous year, or before.

## Considerations

The FY2014 Report uses 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. 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 if a particular agency does not calculate data as prescribed by the measurement, the authors of this Report have endeavored to supplement the data and tables with additional information.

Other considerations should be noted as follows:

- **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. This number is a snapshot in time that demonstrates how many children may be in placement at any given time.

- **Population Flow:** The population flow reflects changes in placements throughout the year. A change is considered to be a discharge or enrollment of any child in a new placement category (*e.g.*, from family home setting to community-based placement), a new jurisdiction (*e.g.*, a transfer from one county to another), or a new placing agency (*e.g.*, a change in custodial responsibility). The population flow counts *placements*, and not *children*, because one child can be placed in more than one category, jurisdiction, or agency in one year. A child may enter a new placement more than once in one year for a number of reasons, including because the child needs to be placed in a more restrictive placement for his or her needs, or because the child has progressed in meeting treatment goals and can be moved to a less restrictive environment. Placement numbers coming from population flow will be higher than the number of children who are actually placed.
- **Rate of New Placement Settings per Jurisdiction:** This shows the trend of children being placed within a jurisdiction. For jurisdictions in which few children are placed each year, the difference of one or two children being placed can exaggerate changes in the trend. The rate of new placement settings comes from the number of new placements (or starts) during the fiscal year, so this number counts placements and not children (see “Population Flow” above).
- **DJS Out-of-Home Placement Information:** The data reported includes 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 is available 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 delinquent or placed by the juvenile court, are not represented in the placement totals and placement costs in this Report.
- **DJS Hospitalization Costs:** When a DJS-committed child is admitted to a psychiatric hospital, DJS pays only the educational portion of the costs, and other entities, such as Medical Assistance or private insurance, pay the remaining costs. This Report includes only educational costs, rather than the total costs.<sup>2</sup>
- **Residential Treatment Center Placements:** These placements are reported by DJS and included in the MHA Residential Treatment Center placements. Because the population flow totals cannot be disaggregated, some placements may be double-counted within the Residential Treatment Center category.
- **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. Costs that were incurred by MHA from the previous fiscal year but that are billed in the current fiscal year are reconciled in the

---

<sup>2</sup> Prior to 2013, this Report included total costs.

following year. Because of this, current fiscal year costs may be slightly understated and prior fiscal year costs may 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 tables and 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 (see descriptions below).
- **Unknown and Not Available Placements:** An “Unknown” or “Not Available” placement category is used to describe children who have run away or who cannot be identified in a placement category because an agency’s records have not been updated. Differences among the placement subcategories are further explained in each of the placement category descriptions.

## Report Overview

---

This OOHP Report is presented by the Children’s Cabinet. The Children’s Cabinet coordinates the child and family focused service delivery system by emphasizing prevention, early intervention, and community-based services for all children and families. The Children’s Cabinet includes the Secretaries from the Departments of Budget and Management, Disabilities, Health and Mental Hygiene, Human Resources, and Juvenile Services, as well as the State Superintendent of Schools for the Maryland State Department of Education. The Executive Director of the Governor’s Office for Children chairs the Children’s Cabinet.

The FY2014 Report includes a Statewide summary of all out-of-home placements, five-year trend analyses and recommendations for out-of-home placements by the State agencies that place children or fund children’s placements, a description of placements at Maryland’s School for the Blind and School for the Deaf, and a discussion of Family Preservation Services.

The Children’s Cabinet’s objective for the Report is to provide an accurate and precise analysis of each agency’s placement trends and future resource development priorities. The Children’s Cabinet continues to strengthen, develop, and adopt strategies to serve children in their homes and communities. This Report supports a more comprehensive understanding of the needs of children who require out-of-home placement. The Children’s Cabinet agencies seek to improve the tracking and monitoring of placements, and identify meaningful ways to measure progress. These efforts assist the State and local jurisdictions in the planning of effective services and utilizing funding in the most effective and efficient manner.

## Placement Categories

There are four categories of out-of-home placement for children in the State of Maryland. These categories fall on a continuum, beginning with the least restrictive setting (Family Home) and moving toward more highly-structured and treatment-oriented setting (Hospitalization).

<b>Family Home</b>	<b>Non-Community-Based</b>
Adoptive Care Foster Care Formal Relative (Kinship) Care Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care Treatment Foster Care Living-Arrangement – Family Home	Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Programs Non-Secure/Non-Residential Treatment Center Residential Educational Facilities Residential Treatment Centers Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs Living Arrangement – Non-Community-Based
<b>Community-Based</b>	<b>Hospitalization</b>
Independent Living Programs Residential Child Care Programs Community Supported Living Arrangement Living Arrangement – Community-Based	In-Patient Private Psychiatric Hospitalization

**Table 1**

While there is a range of out-of-home placement types, only DHR and DJS place children in all the placement categories. DHMH and its administrations (MHA, DDA, and ADAA) place children in only one category each. MSDE only funds placements and does not directly place children. Table 2 illustrates overlaps among agencies in placement subcategories, and the subcategories specific to a particular agency.

**State Agency Placement Categories: Placement Totals on 1/31/2014**

Placing Agency	Family Home Placement						Community-Based Placement				Non-Community-Based Placement						Hospitalization Placement		
	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 Supported Living Arrangement	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	Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	In-Patient Private	Psychiatric Hospitalization
DHR	32	1128	761	326	1541	236	188	611		43				183		89	9	8	
DJS		4			86		13	221			24	159	41		141	184			8
MSDE														47					
MHA														418					
DDA								17	68										
ADAA															196				

Table 2

## **Organization of the Report**

---

---

### **Out-of-Home Placement Summaries**

The out-of-home placement portion of the FY2014 Report consists of summaries from each of the child-placing and funding agencies, as well as a Statewide summary of all placements in Maryland. Each section utilizes the same data metrics to aid comparison between the varying populations served by the agencies, organized under the following headings:

#### Summary

An overview of the number of children in placement during each year's one-day census and the total number of placements at the beginning of the fiscal year, in addition to the number of placements added during the fiscal year, the population flow during the last five fiscal years, rate of placement by jurisdiction based on one-day census data, total costs, and costs per bed-day.

#### Recommendations

The agency's or administration's strategies to: address gaps in services, serve children in their home jurisdictions whenever possible, and reduce the length of stay in out-of-home placement programs while increasing the rates of positive discharges to less-restrictive settings or permanent homes.

#### Addendum

This section includes data on the demographics of children in placement (age, gender, race), out-of-State placement trends, as well as out-of-State demographics for agencies with 10 or more out-of-State placements. The section also includes placement subcategory total costs and costs per bed-day for agencies with more than one placement category (DHR and DJS).

### **Maryland School for the Deaf and Blind**

A brief description of the number of students enrolled and costs (residential and educational) associated with the two schools.

### **Family Preservation Services**


A summary of the outcomes achieved by families participating in Family Preservation Services to prevent the out-of-home placement of children involved with the services.

### **Appendix: Placement by Jurisdiction**

The number of children from each jurisdiction in Maryland who were in out-of-home placements on January 31, 2014 and where they were placed, by out-of-home placement subcategory.

## Statewide Summary

The Maryland regulations addressing DHR’s out-of-home placement program (COMAR 07.02.11) set forth the requirements of the program to reduce the rate at which children enter and re-enter out-of-home placements; reduce the median length of stay in out-of-home placements; minimize the number of placement changes within 24 months of entering out-of-home placements; increase the percentage of reunifications, guardianships, and adoptions; and decrease the number of children in out-of-home placements.




Statewide Placement Trends								
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	2,035	1,718	1,514	1,465	1,335	1,161	-10.5%	-13.0%
Family Home Settings	6,755	6,490	5,840	5,359	4,619	4,114	-9.4%	-10.9%
Hospitalization	29	31	43	18	31	25	8.1%	-19.4%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	1,704	1,686	1,646	1,531	1,514	1,482	-2.7%	-2.1%
Placement Category Not Available	251	435	336	302	324	322	9.4%	-0.6%
All Categories	10,774	10,360	9,379	8,675	7,823	7,104	-8.0%	-9.2%

Table 3

The number of children in out-of-home placements has been steadily decreasing since FY2009. In the last fiscal year, the number decreased by 719.<sup>3</sup> The most significant decrease has been in the Community-Based Placement category, with a decrease of 17.9% from last fiscal year. It is estimated that nearly 8,000 Maryland children are in out-of-home placements on any given day.

<sup>3</sup>The number of non-community-based residential placements is higher than actual placements because DJS Residential Treatment Center placements (included in the number of non-community-based residential placements) are reported by both DJS and MHA. DJS Residential Treatment Center placements are included in Table 60. The numbers are unchanged in Table 3 to ensure consistency between the data based on the Statewide one-day census totals, which are not disaggregated by placement subcategory.



All Agencies Total Served								
Category	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Family Home	15,306	15,720	14,772	14,351	12,682	11,015	-6.2%	-13.1%
Community-Based	5,370	4,544	4,161	3,935	3,563	2,925	-11.3%	-17.9%
Non-Community Based	6,637	6,992	6,154	6,115	5,865	5,737	-2.7%	-2.2%
Hospitalization	326	307	292	306	393	337	1.7%	-14.2%
Not Available	1,057	572	887	877	850	832	0.6%	-2.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28,696</b>	<b>28,135</b>	<b>26,266</b>	<b>25,584</b>	<b>23,353</b>	<b>20,846</b>	<b>-6.1%</b>	<b>-10.7%</b>

Table 4

The total number of out-of-home placements each fiscal year has decreased, as well, by more than 8,000 in the last five fiscal years. As shown in Table 4, the number of Total Served comes from the number of children in out-of-home placements at the start of the fiscal year and all the new out-of-home placements added until the end of the fiscal year.

All Agencies Placement Population Flow (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	25,284	17,170	8,414
2013	8,278	15,075	23,353	15,747	7,606
2014	7,337	12,983	20,320	13,562	6,758
Three-Year Change	-23.9%	-21.9%	-22.6%	-19.6%	-28.1%
Average Yearly Change	-8.5%	-6.7%	-7.8%	-6.1%	-9.7%
Recent Year Change	-11.4%	-13.9%	-13.0%	-13.9%	-11.1%

Table 5

The rate of new out-of-home placement has also decreased (Table 6). FY2014 had a less than average rate of new out-of-home placement in the last four fiscal years, with 9.8 per 1,000 in the population of children in Maryland. Fluctuations in the rates can be common in jurisdictions with low populations, but many jurisdictions had significant decreases. New out-of-home placement indicates children initially being placed or being moved from one placement to another. Placement moves may occur when a child is in need of more intensive services or when a child has met placement goals and enters a less restrictive setting.

All Agencies Rate of New Placement Setting By Jurisdiction									
Jurisdiction	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Three Year Change	Average Change	Last Year Change	
Allegany	13.9	14.3	17.6	19.7	17.4	22%	7%	-12%	
Anne Arundel	5.5	4.8	6.1	6.5	5.6	17%	2%	-14%	
Baltimore	10.3	9.1	9.2	8.5	7.3	-20%	-8%	-14%	
Baltimore City	44.7	42.7	50.7	43	36.4	-15%	-4%	-15%	
Calvert	9.0	9.5	8.5	10.5	9.1	-4%	1%	-13%	
Caroline	12.7	14.0	13.1	10.1	11.4	-19%	-2%	13%	
Carroll	5.3	6.2	7.6	6.4	5.5	-11%	2%	-14%	
Cecil	13.0	13.2	15.3	16.1	17.9	36%	8%	11%	
Charles	8.1	7.6	7.8	7.4	7.8	3%	-1%	5%	
Dorchester	19.5	12.1	11.9	17	11.2	-7%	-8%	-34%	
Frederick	8.4	6.9	8.1	7.3	6.3	-9%	-6%	-14%	
Garrett	22.0	15.1	24.8	21.1	17.1	13%	0%	-19%	
Harford	8.1	8.1	9.8	9.3	9.2	14%	4%	-1%	
Howard	2.9	2.9	2.9	3	2.9	0%	0%	-3%	
Kent	11.3	9.5	7.7	6.7	8.1	-15%	-7%	21%	
Montgomery	5.6	5.1	4.9	4.9	4.2	-18%	-7%	-14%	
Prince George's	5.9	5.7	6.9	6.9	6.3	11%	2%	-9%	
Queen Anne's	8.5	6.6	7.6	7.6	2.8	-58%	-18%	-63%	
Somerset	17.1	14.7	24.3	19.4	18.2	24%	6%	-6%	
St. Mary's	8.2	11.5	10.2	8.3	9.1	-21%	5%	10%	
Talbot	9.8	11.3	13.7	9.5	7.3	-35%	-4%	-23%	
Washington	13.1	13.6	15.1	13	11.1	-18%	-3%	-15%	
Wicomico	10.6	10.6	11.8	11.3	10.2	-4%	-1%	-10%	
Worcester	14.8	12.3	10.4	8.7	10.5	-15%	-7%	21%	
Total	11.6	11.0	12.3	11.2	9.9	-10%	-3%	-12%	


Table 6

Another of Maryland’s goals for out-of-home placement is for children to remain close to their homes so they can preserve their family, social, educational, and cultural connections during the period of out-of-home placement. This is not always possible due to the unavailability of resources to suit the child’s needs in that jurisdiction or because Kinship and Family Foster Care is available away from the child’s home. At least half of the children in out-of-home placement in 10 of Maryland’s 24 jurisdictions were placed in their home jurisdiction. Of all the children placed in Maryland, Baltimore City is the location for 36.4% of out-of-home placements, followed by Somerset County with 18.2% of all out-of-home placements in Maryland.

Statewide Placement By Jurisdiction																												
		Jurisdiction Where Children Were Placed																										
Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children Statewide in placements from jurisdiction	Alegany	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	Out-of-State	Unknown
Alegany	114	1.6%	77	0	2	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	6	2
Anne Arundel	326	4.6%	19	96	41	48	2	2	13	0	3	8	13	9	4	2	1	11	11	1	2	0	0	12	2	0	22	4
Baltimore	737	10.4%	15	7	387	156	0	3	18	6	0	7	12	13	19	7	1	10	12	0	0	1	0	12	1	0	25	25
Baltimore City	2784	39.3%	12	53	984	1261	2	4	40	1	5	8	26	12	47	26	2	28	75	1	4	0	0	17	6	0	83	87
Calvert	115	1.6%	3	6	13	2	43	2	3	0	11	3	2	5	0	1	0	0	4	1	0	4	0	4	2	0	4	2
Caroline	40	0.6%	1	1	6	0	0	10	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	6	0	4	2
Carroll	88	1.2%	7	0	18	6	0	0	39	0	0	0	5	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	2	0
Cecil	193	2.7%	4	2	27	16	0	3	0	112	0	5	2	1	8	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	5
Charles	136	1.9%	2	0	12	5	1	1	1	0	80	3	2	3	0	0	1	4	7	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	3	6
Dorchester	54	0.8%	0	0	8	8	0	1	2	0	0	21	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	5	0
Frederick	182	2.6%	5	1	19	13	0	2	4	2	0	0	92	0	2	5	0	10	3	0	0	0	0	15	1	0	6	2
Garrett	47	0.7%	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	2	4
Harford	300	4.2%	6	2	64	20	0	4	5	9	0	4	4	2	140	1	3	6	2	1	0	0	0	7	0	0	11	9
Howard	90	1.3%	2	4	28	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	0	22	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	0
Kent	22	0.3%	3	0	7	1	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	549	7.7%	16	9	47	28	0	5	4	6	2	4	18	4	4	4	1	313	35	0	0	0	0	17	1	0	22	9
Prince George's	738	10.4%	28	11	81	42	8	1	20	4	13	11	25	20	1	15	7	27	335	1	2	0	1	14	4	0	52	15
Queen Anne's	12	0.2%	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Somerset	40	0.6%	2	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	11	0	0	0	10	0	2	0
St. Mary's	110	1.6%	3	1	13	4	2	0	1	0	12	1	1	1	2	2	0	1	8	1	1	45	0	1	2	0	6	2
Talbot	38	0.5%	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	3	0	0	1
Washington	191	2.7%	10	0	23	12	0	0	4	0	0	1	7	1	1	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	117	0	0	6	3
Wicomico	110	1.6%	6	0	25	10	0	2	2	0	0	13	1	3	0	0	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	32	0	7	0
Worcester	28	0.4%	0	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	12	1	1	1
Out-of-State	48	0.7%	1	0	14	3	1	0	2	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	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	7092	100.0	226	194	1828	1663	60	58	159	143	126	114	232	111	229	86	28	428	503	11	23	53	18	237	87	3	293	179
% of children from jurisdiction			67.5%	29.4%	52.5%	45.3%	37.4%	25.0%	44.3%	58.0%	58.8%	38.9%	50.5%	53.2%	46.7%	24.4%	18.2%	57.0%	45.4%	33.3%	27.5%	40.9%	28.9%	61.3%	29.1%	3.6%	31.3%	0.0%
% children Statewide in all			3.2%	2.7%	25.8%	23.4%	0.8%	0.8%	2.2%	2.0%	1.8%	1.6%	3.3%	1.6%	3.2%	1.2%	0.4%	6.0%	7.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.7%	0.3%	3.3%	1.2%	0.0%	4.1%	2.5%

Table 7


## Costs



Statewide Total Costs								
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$183,469,850	\$145,760,440	\$122,210,854	\$117,152,599	\$115,749,751	\$104,784,520	-10.3%	-9.5%
Family Home Settings	\$150,052,028	\$154,528,388	\$136,152,905	\$130,233,996	\$122,415,468	\$122,192,288	-3.9%	-0.2%
Hospitalization	\$110,292	\$97,064	\$28,977	\$14,946	\$41,220	\$2,082	-9.9%	-94.9%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	\$163,382,867	\$156,486,635	\$139,430,318	\$147,085,835	\$138,213,891	\$63,113,560	-14.0%	-54.3%
All Categories	\$497,015,037	\$456,872,528	\$397,823,054	\$394,487,375	\$376,420,330	\$290,092,450	-9.9%	-22.9%

Table 8

Placement costs have been driven down each year since FY2009, with a total reduction of more than \$205 million since that time. This is mostly due to the decrease in the number of children entering out-of-home placements.



Statewide Costs Per Bed Day								
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$253	\$233	\$219	\$226	\$236	\$297	3.9%	25.6%
Family Home Settings	\$89	\$94	\$90	\$95	\$102	\$165	15.3%	62.5%
Hospitalization	\$140	\$141	\$99	\$168	\$118	<\$1	NA	NA
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	\$325	\$385	\$329	\$366	\$338	\$340	1.6%	0.6%
All Categories	\$170	\$171	\$160	\$172	\$179	\$227	6.5%	26.9%

Table 9

## Statewide Recommendations



Maryland’s State child and family-serving agencies provide a continuum of care to meet an array of needs along a wide spectrum. The purpose of the State Resource Plan is to ensure that the State is doing the best it can to build a multifaceted network that can strengthen the lives of every child in need in Maryland. In the remainder of this Report, State agencies will describe the means by which they meet children’s needs and the challenges they face in helping them. The following is a summary of the State agencies’ recommendations to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the State network. Please note that the Interagency Strategic Plan<sup>4</sup> may also be consulted as a resource for in-depth discussion of issues surrounding out of home placement and for further recommendations:

Agency	Recommendations
DHR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand intensive family preservation and post-permanency services.</li> <li>• Create a trauma-informed system that uses standardized assessments to identify services and supports for children and families to prevent out-of-home care and re-entries into out-of-home care as well as to improve well-being.</li> <li>• Support programs such as <i>Family Connections, Homebuilders, SafeCare, and Functional Family Therapy</i> to promote family preservation - multi-faceted, community-based programs that work with families experiencing difficulty in meeting the basic needs of their children and at-risk for child emotional and/or physical neglect.</li> </ul>
DJS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain the Continuum of Care statute to ensure that DJS continues to have the ability to quickly move youth as necessary from committed placements that are not working out, without need for further court action.</li> <li>• Support DJS capital projects to ensure that sufficient in-State secure slots are available for high-risk committed youth.</li> </ul>
DDA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify youth early before they age out of support systems and transition planning.</li> <li>• Continue to work with other administrations and community resources to allow children to remain in their homes.</li> </ul>
MSDE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue working with Maryland providers of services to children with autism through the Autism Waiver.</li> <li>• Continue to support local schools systems to enhance services and supports for students to remain in their community schools.</li> <li>• Support cross-agency collaboration to ensure the development of community-based and residential programs to meet the needs of students typically placed out-of-State and to facilitate the return of these students to Maryland programs and schools.</li> </ul>
MHA	Continue efforts to minimize out-of-State placements through the implementation of a 1915(i) Medicaid State Plan amendment providing intensive wraparound services. The feasibility of in-State Residential Treatment Centers offering specialized services such as treatment for fire-setting and sexually offensive behavior should continue to be assessed.

<sup>4</sup>The Interagency Strategic Plan is a collaborative effort by the Maryland Children’s Cabinet in partnership with families, communities, and providers to improve the child-family serving delivery system to better anticipate and respond to the needs of youth and families. For more information about the ISP, please visit [www.mdchildrencabinetisp.org](http://www.mdchildrencabinetisp.org).

# STATEWIDE Addendum

## Maryland State Placement Trends by Category



**Statewide Family Home Settings Placement Trends**


Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Adoptive Care	100	98	60	47	37	32	-19.4%	-13.5%
Foster Care	1,552	1,473	1,365	1,327	1,185	1,132	-6.1%	-4.5%
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	1,558	1,460	1,316	1,207	936	761	-13.1%	-18.7%
Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care	1,027	854	634	491	382	326	-20.4%	-14.7%
Treatment Foster Care	2,112	2,152	2,100	1,981	1,757	1,627	-5.0%	-7.4%
Living Arrangement - Family Home	406	453	365	306	322	236	-9.1%	-26.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,755</b>	<b>6,490</b>	<b>5,840</b>	<b>5,359</b>	<b>4,619</b>	<b>4,114</b>	<b>-9.4%</b>	<b>-10.9%</b>

**Table 10**

**Statewide Non-Community-Based Settings Placement Trends**

Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	9	12	15	14	25	24	25.2%	-4.0%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	174	178	166	160	185	159	-1.3%	-14.1%
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	32	23	35	45	39	41	8.9%	5.1%
Residential Educational Facilities	52	59	44	58	53	47	0.0%	-11.3%
Residential Treatment Centers	988	914	826	719	729	722	-5.9%	-1.0%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	365	400	438	429	387	359	0.0%	-7.2%
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	84	100	122	106	96	89	2.2%	-7.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,704</b>	<b>1,686</b>	<b>1,646</b>	<b>1,531</b>	<b>1,514</b>	<b>1,441</b>	<b>-3.3%</b>	<b>-4.8%</b>


**Table 12**



**Statewide Community-Based Placement Trends**

Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	217	261	234	213	230	201	-0.7%	-12.6%
Residential Child Care Program	1,625	1,264	1,105	1,108	966	849	-11.9%	-12.1%
Community Supported Living Arrangement (CSLA)	135	117	96	84	81	68	-12.7%	-16.0%
Living Arrangement - Community-Based	58	76	79	60	58	43	-3.7%	-25.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,035</b>	<b>1,718</b>	<b>1,514</b>	<b>1,465</b>	<b>1,335</b>	<b>1,161</b>	<b>-10.5%</b>	<b>-13.0%</b>

**Table 11**




**Statewide Hospitalization Trends**

Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
In-Patient Private	7	6	16	5	6	9	30.7%	50.0%
Psychiatric Hospitalization	22	25	27	13	25	16	5.2%	-36.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>-19.4%</b>

**Table 13**

## STATEWIDE Addendum Statewide Demographic Comparisons

### Age




#### Statewide Age Trends

Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	2,122	1,953	1,647	1,616	1,481	1,346	-26.8%	-9.1%
6 through 11	1,842	1,562	1,306	1,116	1,034	881	-30.7%	-14.8%
12 through 17	4,703	4,481	3,972	3,639	3,201	2,631	-27.3%	-17.8%
18 and over	2,107	2,364	2,454	2,304	2,107	1,891	-19.7%	-10.3%
Total	10,774	10,360	9,379	8,675	7,823	6,749	-26.1%	-13.7%

**Table 14**

### Race




#### Statewide Race Trends

Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	13	10	7	6	6	7	-16.8%	0.0%
Asian	33	33	33	30	32	34	-0.6%	6.7%
Black or African American	7,482	7,131	6,289	5,643	4,949	4,203	-9.8%	-12.3%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	3	5	5	5	3	3	6.7%	-40.0%
White	2,602	2,489	2,383	2,388	2,247	1,952	-3.6%	-5.9%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	302	309	279	267	236	233	-5.8%	-11.6%
Other	223	252	238	227	220	191	-0.1%	-3.1%
Unknown	116	131	145	109	130	126	4.5%	19.3%
Total	10,774	10,360	9,379	8,675	7,823	6,749	-7.7%	-9.8%

**Table 16**

### Gender




#### Statewide Gender Trends

Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	6,085	5,766	5,285	4,815	4,370	3,768	-9.1%	-13.8%
Female	4,689	4,593	4,093	3,859	3,453	2,979	-8.6%	-13.7%
Unknown	0	1	1	1	0	2	NA	NA
Total	10,774	10,360	9,379	8,675	7,823	6,749	-8.9%	-13.7%

**Table 15**

## STATEWIDE Addendum

### Statewide Out-of-State One-Day Comparisons




Maryland Out of State Placements								
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	69	50	45	39	54	52	-3.2%	-3.7%
Family Home Settings	237	187	141	97	89	73	-20.6%	-18.0%
Hospitalization	0	0	0	0	1	5	NA	400.0%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	182	140	155	161	155	126	-6.2%	-18.7%
Placement Category Not Available	0	3	1	1	16	17	NA	6.3%
All Categories	488	380	342	298	315	273	-10.5%	-13.3%

**Table 17**

# STATEWIDE Addendum

## Statewide Out-of-State One-Day Comparisons


### Age



Maryland Out-of-State Age Trends								
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	89	69	44	28	29	39	-11.4%	34.5%
6 through 11	69	44	31	25	28	13	-25.3%	-53.6%
12 through 17	210	154	169	155	146	116	-10.3%	-20.5%
18 and over	120	113	98	90	112	105	-1.8%	-6.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>488</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>-10.5%</b>	<b>-13.3%</b>

Table 18


### Gender



Maryland Out-of-State Gender Trends								
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	323	253	246	221	218	187	-10.0%	-14.2%
Female	165	127	96	77	97	84	-10.9%	-13.4%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	2	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>488</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>-10.5%</b>	<b>-13.3%</b>

Table 19

### Race




Maryland Out-of-State Race Trends								
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	1	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	4	2	3	0	1	0	NA	-100.0%
Black or African American	295	239	235	216	223	180	-9.0%	-19.3%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	169	121	87	69	74	74	-14.0%	0.0%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	9	7	9	6	6	8	1.3%	33.3%
Other	7	6	6	6	8	9	6.3%	12.5%
Unknown	4	4	2	1	3	2	13.3%	-33.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>488</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>-10.5%</b>	<b>-13.3%</b>

Table 20

# STATEWIDE Addendum

## Statewide Out-of-State Cost Comparisons


### Total Costs



Statewide Out-of-State Total Costs								
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$4,677,421	\$2,529,376	\$6,167,030	\$6,481,015	\$6,545,427	\$7,710,073	24.4%	17.8%
Family Home Settings	\$142,750	\$117,590	\$87,060	\$65,818	\$56,033	\$47,603	-19.6%	-15.0%
Hospitalization	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	\$20,004,852	\$16,008,362	\$17,242,719	\$19,139,903	\$18,157,431	\$15,490,295	-4.2%	-14.7%
Not Available	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
All Categories	\$24,825,023	\$18,655,328	\$23,496,809	\$25,686,736	\$24,758,892	\$23,247,971	0.1%	-6.1%

**Table 21**

### Per Bed-Day



Statewide Costs Per Bed Day								
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$196	\$133	\$353	\$380	\$412	\$475	32.9%	15.3%
Family Home Settings	\$2	\$2	\$2	\$2	\$3	\$3	6.9%	12.8%
Hospitalization	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	\$456	\$431	\$363	\$408	\$463	\$264	-7.7%	-43.0%
Not Available	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All Categories	\$186	\$165	\$220	\$278	\$325	\$267	9.5%	-17.9%

**Table 22**

## Department of Human Resources (DHR) Summary

DHR prioritizes child safety, permanency, and well-being for children and families. DHR is committed to ensuring that children and youth are kept with their families whenever safe and possible. This is one of the central principles of the Place Matters and Family-Centered Practice initiatives. Since the beginning of Place Matters, the number of children in DHR out-of-home (OOH) care has decreased 48% (10,330 in July 2007 to 5,339 in June 2014).<sup>5</sup>


Maryland's Family-Centered Practice model is a fundamental component of DHR's and the local Departments of Social Services' work with families. Workers develop individualized service plans based on comprehensive assessments of the families' strengths and needs, with goals of increasing families' capacities to protect their children. Family Involvement Meetings (FIMs) are also used to engage families in service plan development, especially when safety/risk issues are severe enough that a child may be removed from the home. When OOH placement is necessary, the first choice is always a family home (family foster home or relative placement).

FIMs and other Family-Centered Practice approaches strengthen families by bringing additional resources to families, and helping children stay with their families of origin or relatives. These efforts are designed to reduce risk factors which lead to abuse and neglect, increase safety for children, and avoid OOH placement or reduce time in care.

Most children—an average of 75% over the last six years—in DHR OOH care are in family homes (Table 23). The Family-Centered Practices of child and family inclusion in case planning and decision-making have been crucial in achieving these goals.

### DHR 2014 Highlights

The number of children in DHR OOH care is at its lowest point in at least the past 25 years, with a 39% reduction since 2009 and a 48% reduction since 2007 both as an absolute number and as a proportion of children in placement.<sup>6</sup> In 2014, 73% of children/youth in DHR OOH care were in family homes, with another 15% in community-based placements (Table 23).



<sup>5</sup> State Stat Place Matters data June 2014; DHR.


<sup>6</sup> State Stat Place Matters data June 2014; DHR.

DHR Placement Trends								
Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	1,649	1,321	1,170	1,116	978	842	-12.4%	-13.9%
Family Home Settings	6,672	6,397	5,765	5,286	4,548	4,024	-9.6%	-11.5%
Hospitalization	21	23	38	11	22	17	16.2%	-22.7%
Non-Community Base Residential Placement	335	339	306	299	279	272	-4.0%	-2.5%
Placement Category Not Available	251	435	336	302	324	322	9.4%	-0.6%
All Categories	8,928	8,515	7,615	7,014	6,151	5,477	-9.3%	-11.0%

Table 23

Across all 24 Maryland jurisdictions, 54% of all children in DHR OOH care are placed in their home jurisdiction. These placements are in alignment with Place Matters and Family-Centered Practice values, which focus on the placement of children close to their families and communities when safe and possible, in order to maintain relationships and facilitate frequent family visitation. Other children may be placed in adjacent jurisdictions or even out of State, which may be closer to a child's home than a location within the same jurisdiction or state. Additionally, relative placements even out of the jurisdiction (or out of State) may be preferable to non-relative placements within the jurisdiction.

Nearly half (46%) of children in DHR OOH care comes from Baltimore City. Another 27% come from Baltimore County, Montgomery, and Prince George's Counties; each of these jurisdictions placed more than 60% of children within their own County as of January 31, 2014. Baltimore City had 48% of its children in care placed within its jurisdiction. Each other local department/jurisdiction had less than 4% each of the total DHR OOH population.



DHR Total Served								
Category	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Family Home	15,095	15,510	14,564	14,178	12,498	11,039	-5.9%	-11.7%
Community-Based	4,276	3,592	3,317	3,074	2,719	2,235	-12.1%	-17.8%
Non-Community Based	732	831	794	755	751	675	-1.3%	-10.1%
Hospitalization	253	237	208	232	297	294	4.0%	-1.0%
Not Available	1,057	572	887	877	850	866	1.4%	1.9%
Total	21,413	20,742	19,770	19,116	17,115	15,109	-6.7%	-11.7%

Table 24

DHR Population Flow						
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	
2013	6,606	10,509	17,115	11,157	5,958	
2014	5,919	9,190	15,109	9,811	5,298	
Three-Year Change	-25.6%	-22.2%	-23.6%	-20.0%	-29.4%	
Average Yearly Change	-7.3%	-5.1%	-6.0%	-5.0%	-7.7%	
Recent Year Change	-10.4%	-12.6%	-11.7%	-12.1%	-11.1%	

Table 25


DHR 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	Out-of-State	Unknown
Allegany	81	1.5%	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	6	2
Anne Arundel	163	3.0%	0	86	19	17	1	2	0	0	3	0	1	0	3	2	0	4	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	4
Baltimore	561	10.2%	0	7	343	99	0	2	5	6	0	4	6	2	19	7	0	6	12	0	0	1	0	8	1	0	8	25
Baltimore City	2496	45.6%	1	51	922	1186	2	3	10	1	5	2	6	3	47	23	0	15	75	1	4	0	0	5	2	0	45	87
Calvert	87	1.6%	0	5	9	1	41	2	1	0	11	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	4	1	0	4	0	2	0	0	1	2
Caroline	34	0.6%	0	1	4	0	0	9	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	6	0	3	2
Carroll	46	0.8%	0	0	11	2	0	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Cecil	158	2.9%	0	1	19	5	0	1	0	111	0	4	0	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5
Charles	103	1.9%	0	0	5	2	0	0	1	0	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	6
Dorchester	26	0.5%	0	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	0	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	4	0
Frederick	123	2.2%	0	0	12	4	0	2	3	1	0	0	67	0	2	3	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	12	1	0	4	2
Garrett	39	0.7%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	2	4
Harford	241	4.4%	0	2	52	6	0	3	2	9	0	0	3	0	138	1	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	9
Howard	62	1.1%	0	4	23	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0
Kent	10	0.2%	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	391	7.1%	0	6	35	7	0	1	3	3	2	0	14	0	4	4	1	245	32	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	11	9
Prince George's	501	9.1%	1	8	45	16	7	1	3	4	13	1	1	1	1	14	0	15	319	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	31	15
Queen Anne's	9	0.2%	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Somerset	30	0.5%	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	0	0	0	9	0	1	0
St. Mary's	91	1.7%	0	0	11	1	2	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	8	1	1	44	0	0	1	0	5	2
Talbot	25	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	1	0	0	1
Washington	146	2.7%	2	0	16	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	103	0	0	6	3
Wicomico	33	0.6%	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	4	0	0
Worcester	21	0.4%	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	9	1	1	1	1
Out-of-State	0	0.0%	0	0	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	5477	100.0	66	172	1541	1359	54	41	60	137	122	37	110	43	226	77	6	301	473	11	22	51	18	159	51	1	160	179
% of children from jurisdiction			75.3	52.8	61.1	47.5	47.1	26.5	63.0	70.3	74.8	46.2	54.5	64.1	57.3	30.6	40.0	62.7	63.7	44.4	33.3	48.4	44.0	70.5	60.6	4.8	0.0	0.0
% children Statewide in all			1.2%	3.1%	28.1%	24.8%	1.0%	0.7%	1.1%	2.5%	2.2%	0.7%	2.0%	0.8%	4.1%	1.4%	0.1%	5.5%	8.6%	0.2%	0.4%	0.9%	0.3%	2.9%	0.9%	0.0%	2.9%	3.3%

Table 26

## DHR Demographics


As of January 31, 2014, 25% of children in DHR OOH care were age 5 and younger; 16% were ages 6 to 11; 33% were ages 12 to 17; and 26% were age 18 and older. These percentages are similar to last year's data. Nearly 60% of youth in DHR OOH care are over the age of 11; this has significant implications for placement needs and challenges. Foster parenting skills, therapeutic treatments, and other service needs of older children and youth are different than those of infants, toddlers, and young children.

Although there is still a significant disparity, the percentages of Black/African-American children in DHR OOH care have been decreasing over the past several years. The percentage of White children also has decreased, but by a smaller percentage. In 2009, 72% of children in DHR OOH care were Black/African-American; in 2014, the percentage fell to 63%. In 2009, 21% of children in DHR OOH care were White; in 2014, 28% were White. Gender remains nearly evenly split between males and females.




DHR All Categories Gender Trends								
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	4,674	4,388	3,922	3,531	3,099	2,754	-10.0%	-11.1%
Female	4,254	4,127	3,692	3,482	3,052	2,721	-8.5%	-10.8%
Unknown	0	0	1	1	0	2	NA	NA
Total	8,928	8,515	7,615	7,014	6,151	5,477	-9.3%	-11.0%

Table 27



DHR All Categories Age Trends								
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	2,121	1,952	1,647	1,615	1,480	1,346	-8.6%	-9.1%
6 through 11	1,773	1,516	1,245	1,058	930	870	-13.2%	-6.5%
12 through 17	3,381	3,201	2,784	2,476	2,046	1,812	-11.6%	-11.4%
18 and over	1,653	1,846	1,939	1,865	1,695	1,449	-2.1%	-14.5%
Total	8,928	8,515	7,615	7,014	6,151	5,477	-9.3%	-11.0%

Table 28



DHR All Categories Race Trends								
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	10	7	4	3	5	5	-6.2%	0.0%
Asian	23	23	24	20	15	23	3.2%	53.3%
Black or African American	6,461	6,085	5,270	4,705	3,988	3,449	-11.7%	-13.5%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	3	5	3	3	2	3	8.7%	50.0%
White	1,917	1,843	1,792	1,809	1,698	1,543	-4.2%	-9.1%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	302	309	278	264	232	229	-5.2%	-1.3%
Other	118	137	139	136	112	103	-2.1%	-8.0%
Unknown	94	106	105	74	99	122	7.9%	23.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,928</b>	<b>8,515</b>	<b>7,615</b>	<b>7,014</b>	<b>6,151</b>	<b>5,477</b>	<b>-9.3%</b>	<b>-11.0%</b>

Table 29

### DHR Placement Subcategory Trends

Placement subcategory tables include data on new entries into DHR OOH care, placement changes among children already in DHR OOH care, and children exiting DHR OOH care. Placement changes are counted as both “entries” and “exits.” The Total Served, Entries, and Exits numbers are therefore duplicate counts of children in care, representing the number of placements, not children (a child may have multiple placements within a fiscal year, and each placement is counted; therefore a child may be counted multiple times.).

These placement changes are often appropriate and to a lesser level of “restrictiveness” – for example, a child may move from a group home to a family foster home and then to trial home visit with his/her biological parents, in preparation for reunification. Or, a child may need a short-term hospitalization and then be placed into a group home or foster home.

As the total DHR OOH care population has decreased since July 2007, the numbers of family home and community-based placements have correspondingly decreased. There was a total DHR OOH population decrease of 39% from 2009 to 2014; there was a corresponding 40% decrease in family home placements and a higher 49% decrease in community-based placements. The larger decrease in community-based placements is a result of the Place Matters focus on family home placements for children, and the idea that every child deserves a family. There has been a 19% decrease in both hospitalizations and non-community based placements since 2009.

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

- 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).

Within the family home subcategory, the greatest decreases are seen in adoptive and formal relative (kinship) and restrictive relative (kinship) care placements. Meanwhile, although the raw numbers of foster care, treatment foster care, and living arrangement/family homes (trial home visit or own home/apartment) have decreased, the proportion of children in these placements (out of all DHR placements) has been increasing.

Care must be taken when interpreting Family Home data, if used to analyze private provider usage. Thirty-three percent (33%) of Family Home placements are specific to individual children – meaning, they are relative homes: Formal Relative (Kinship) Care, Restrictive Relative (Kinship Care), or Living Arrangement – Family Home (primarily trial home visits). Meanwhile, another 1% are adoptive homes, 38% are Treatment Foster Care placements (the majority of which are private providers), and 28% are regular foster care which typically are public homes (*i.e.*, licensed by the local Department of Social Services).

Community-based placements constitute DHR's second-most used placement type; an average of 16% of all DHR children/youth are in community-based placements. For DHR, this includes: college, JobCorps, independent living residential programs, and residential child care programs (group homes).

Twenty-six percent of all children/youth in DHR care as of January 31, 2014 were above age 17; college, JobCorps, and independent living placements are age-appropriate for this population, and therefore least-restrictive. Fifty-eight percent of all youth in DHR community-based placements are age 18 and older.

Youth age 18 and over have a choice to remain in DHR OOH care or not; they may choose to remain in care until age 21, but are not legally required to do so. Youth are eligible for independent living programs at age 16.

Less than 1% of children in DHR OOH care are placed in the State's most restrictive placements (hospitalizations), while an average of 4% are in non-community-based placements (Residential Treatment Centers, Correctional Institutions, or Secure Detention). Placements of children/youth in these settings are driven by severe mental health and medical needs, and/or

the juvenile/adult criminal justice system, although past abuse and trauma may contribute to individual children’s mental health issues and/or criminal acting-out behaviors.

There has also been an average of 5% of child records with incomplete placement information – this includes children on runaway status, as well as children whose placement data has not been fully entered into MD CHESIE (DHR’s client information system).


### **DHR Out-of-State (OOS)**

Only 3% of all DHR OOH placements on January 31, 2014 were out-of-State; this is consistent with the percentage in prior years. Of those, the largest number was family home placements, and 66% of children in family homes were placed with family members, adoptive homes, or their own homes. Only one percent of all community-based placements were out-of-State, primarily residential child care (group home) placements but also independent living, college, and JobCorps placements. Residential treatment centers, hospitalizations, and detention and correctional institutions were other out-of-State placements.

### **DHR Costs**

DHR funds only two categories of placements - family home and community-based placements, although not all of these placements require funding. Family foster home placements of trial home placement and formal kinship care placements do not require funding, nor do some types of community-based placements. Hospitalizations are paid for by Medical Assistance, as is the residential portion of residential treatment center placements (non-community based); the other non-community based placements of secure detention or correctional institution are mandated for and paid for by the criminal justice system for youth detained, charged, adjudicated, and/or found guilty of criminal or delinquent behavior.


Over the past five fiscal years, DHR’s residential costs have continued to decrease, with an average annual decrease of 8%, and an overall decrease of 35% since 2008. In FY2009, the costs were just over \$300M. In FY2013, residential costs were slightly under \$200M, for the first time in several years; in FY 2014, the costs decreased to just under \$195M.



DHR Cost Trends									
Cost Type	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change	2009 - 2014 Change
Total	\$394,552,605	\$362,826,762	\$350,625,684	\$309,430,208	\$282,614,057	\$278,030,287	-7%	-2%	-30%
Residential	\$301,566,171	\$264,644,544	\$255,439,051	\$215,361,539	\$199,942,040	\$194,867,565	-8%	-3%	-35%
Educational	\$6,028,754	\$9,439,103	\$8,972,787	\$7,854,822	\$6,799,657	\$7,966,645	9%	17%	32%
Administrative	\$86,957,680	\$88,743,115	\$86,213,846	\$86,213,846	\$75,872,360	\$75,196,077	-3%	-1%	-14%
% Residential	76%	73%	73%	70%	71%	70%			
% Educational	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%			
% Administrative	22%	24%	25%	28%	27%	27%			

Table 30

Total costs, which include residential as well as education and administrative costs, also continue to decrease. The average annual decrease of total costs is 7%, with an overall decrease of 30% since 2009, to \$278M in FY 2014. Education costs, however, have increased from \$6M in FY 2009 to \$8M in FY 2014, while administrative costs have decreased 14% from \$87M in FY 2009 to \$75M in FY 2014.<sup>7</sup>



DHR All Categories Cost Per Bed-Day Trends								
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$281	\$250	\$229	\$233	\$244	\$278	0%	14%
Family Home Settings	\$86	\$92	\$88	\$93	\$99	\$111	5%	12%
Hospitalization	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not Available	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All Categories	\$135	\$127	\$118	\$124	\$132	\$146	2%	11%

Table 31

Community-based placements continue to have higher per-bed-day costs than family home placements, with a FY2014 average bed-day cost of \$278, compared to \$111 family home placements (only paid placements were included in these averages). Despite the higher per-bed-day cost, however, community-based placements constitute 40% of all DHR residential placements costs, while family homes constitute 60%; this is due to the larger number of family home placements.

<sup>7</sup> Education and administrative costs were not reported in the last three JCR Reports.

## DHR Recommendations

The primary goal of DHR is to prevent maltreatment and out-of-home placement of children and youth—when placement is necessary to protect a child’s safety, reunification is the preferred goal; therefore, services that can support these goals are the priority of DHR.

DHR has identified the following critical areas for increased services:

- Services to children ages 0 to 8 and at risk for out-of-home placement;
- Services to youth ages 14 to 17 and at risk for out-of-home placement;
- Older youth in out-of-home care;
- Children/youth exiting out-of-home care and at risk for reentry to out-of-home care; and
- A need to strengthen all services to build a system of trauma-informed care.

In FY 2013, children 0-8 and 14-17 years old represent 81% of all entries into out-of-home placement;<sup>8</sup> 26% of children in DHR’s OOH population in FY 2014 were over age 17. Slightly more than 15% of children exiting DHR OOH care re-enter care within 12-months (FY 2013 data).<sup>9</sup> Trauma affects nearly all children in the child welfare system, as well as many parents and caregivers.

DHR has several current initiatives which address these needs:

1. Award of IV-E Waiver Block Grant – DHR was awarded a 5-year, \$650 million federal demonstration project from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services that allows Maryland more flexibility in using federal foster care funds to achieve improved safety, permanency and well-being of vulnerable children. This grant allows funds that could previously only be used as reimbursement for out-of-home placement to be used for in-home supports, prevention services, and other services that keep children at home safely. The project includes an extensive planning process and can begin as early as July 1, 2015.
2. Performance-based contracting for residential congregate care providers (RCCs) (or group homes) increases accountability and quality of community-based out of home care.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Maryland Department of Human Resources Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver*, Maryland Department of Human Resources, February 2014, <http://www.dhr.state.md.us/documents/Data%20and%20Reports/SSA/Maryland%202014%20IV-E%20Waiver%20Application.pdf>.

<sup>9</sup> *Maryland Department of Human Resources Child and Family Services Plan, 2015 – 2019*, Maryland Department of Human Resources, June 2014.

3. Continuation of Family-Centered Practice and Place Matters initiatives, which focus on child, youth, and family involvement, natural and community supports, and keeping children in their homes and communities whenever safe and possible. Family Involvement Meetings are used to plan services, identify resources, avoid out-of-home placement, and engage the family. Guardianship Assistance Program, Kinship Navigators, and Family Finding are used to avoid out-home-placement and/or help children find permanent homes with relatives.
4. Ready by 21™ is Maryland's initiative to ensure that youth are prepared for the transition into adulthood. Focusing on the five core areas of housing, education, finances, health, and mentoring, Ready by 21 provides a framework and key strategies that are implemented at the local level by the LDSS and their community partners. Ready by 21 is designed to ensure that youth have the necessary skills and resources to integrate back into their homes and communities when they reunify with their families or to be successful if they emancipate from care at age 21.
5. Additional programs such as Youth Matter, Alternative Response, and Tuition Waivers further engage and strengthen youth and families.

DHR is also working to expand additional programs and services, subject to available funding:


1. DHR will expand intensive family preservation and post-permanency service, including both prevention and post-permanency services.
2. DHR proposes to create a trauma-informed system that uses standardized assessments to identify services and supports for children and families to prevent out-of-home care and re-entries into out-of-home care as well as to improve well-being.
3. **Family Connections**: A multi-faceted, community-based evidence-based program that works with families experiencing difficulty in meeting the basic needs of their children and at-risk for child emotional and/or physical neglect.
4. **Homebuilders**: An intensive evidence-based family preservation program that works with the caregivers to provide in-home crisis intervention, counseling, and life skills education over a short-term period.
5. **SafeCare**: An in-home evidence-based parenting model for parents with children ages 0-5 who are at risk for or have a history of child abuse or neglect. SafeCare provides direct skill training with parents using four modules: health, home safety, parent-child/parent-infant interactions, and problem solving and communication.
6. **Functional Family Therapy (FFT)**: FFT is an evidence-based therapy designed for 11-18 year-olds with behavioral health problems including conduct and substance abuse problems. FFT improves family relationships by teaching families how to promote the safety of their children, improve communication skills and skills for solving family problems.

*Additional considerations:*

Based on LDSS and stakeholder feedback through advisory committees and the quality assurance process, and SSA analysis, DHR would prioritize the following within available resources:


- Specialized resources and increased awareness for the child victims of human sex trafficking that DHR serves.
- Foster and adoptive parents for teens, sibling groups, medically fragile children, and Spanish-speaking children.
- Community services for biological families – for those involved in child welfare as well as for those not involved – including mental health, substance abuse, anger management and financial management services.
- Transportation in every jurisdiction – both intra- and inter-jurisdictional public transportation, for both parents and older youth.
- Job training, employment opportunities, and low-cost housing for both older youth and families.
- Specialized and intensive services for medically fragile, developmentally delayed children, and children/youth with severe mental health disorders.
- Substance abuse treatment programs that accept parents and children together.

## DHR Addendum Subcategory One-Day Census Totals Placement Trends




Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Adoptive Care	100	98	60	47	37	32	-19.4%	-13.5%
Foster Care	1,547	1,466	1,358	1,321	1,180	1,128	-6.1%	-4.4%
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	1,558	1,460	1,316	1,207	936	761	-13.1%	-18.7%
Restrictive Relative (Kinship) Care	1,027	854	634	491	382	326	-20.4%	-14.7%
Treatment Foster Care	2,034	2,066	2,032	1,914	1,691	1,541	-5.3%	-8.9%
Living Arrangement - Family Home	406	453	365	306	322	236	-9.1%	-26.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,672</b>	<b>6,397</b>	<b>5,765</b>	<b>5,286</b>	<b>4,548</b>	<b>4,024</b>	<b>-9.6%</b>	<b>-11.5%</b>

**Table 31**




Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	195	229	205	197	212	188	-0.1%	-11.3%
Residential Child Care Program	1,396	1,016	886	859	708	611	-14.9%	-13.7%
Community Supported Living Arrangement	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Community-Based	58	76	79	60	58	43	-3.7%	-25.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,649</b>	<b>1,321</b>	<b>1,170</b>	<b>1,116</b>	<b>978</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>-12.4%</b>	<b>-13.9%</b>

**Table 32**



Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Educational Facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	251	239	184	193	183	183	-5.6%	0.0%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	84	100	122	106	96	89	2.2%	-7.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>-4.0%</b>	<b>-2.5%</b>


**Table 33**



Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
In-Patient Private	7	6	16	5	6	9	30.7%	50.0%
Psychiatric Hospitalization	22	25	27	13	25	16	5.2%	-36.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>-19.4%</b>

**Table 34**


## DHR Addendum Subcategory Demographic Totals Age



**DHR Family Home Settings**

Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	2,091	1,892	1,622	1,589	1,461	1,324	-8.7%	-9.4%
6 through 11	1,599	1,386	1,166	984	871	816	-12.5%	-6.3%
12 through 17	2,069	2,140	1,960	1,744	1,377	1,239	-9.4%	-10.0%
18 and over	913	979	1,017	969	839	645	-6.0%	-23.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,672</b>	<b>6,397</b>	<b>5,765</b>	<b>5,286</b>	<b>4,548</b>	<b>4,024</b>	<b>-9.6%</b>	<b>-11.5%</b>


**Table 35**



**DHR Non-Community-Based Settings**

Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	30	17	21	27	17	17	-5.7%	0.0%
12 through 17	255	250	193	192	186	176	-6.8%	-5.4%
18 and over	50	72	92	80	76	79	11.5%	3.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>-4.0%</b>	<b>-2.5%</b>


**Table 37**



**DHR Community-Based Settings**

Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	15	4	1	6	5	3	59.0%	-40.0%
6 through 11	116	71	34	36	36	31	-19.8%	-13.9%
12 through 17	914	610	510	475	401	322	-18.4%	-19.7%
18 and over	604	636	625	599	536	486	-4.1%	-9.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,649</b>	<b>1,321</b>	<b>1,170</b>	<b>1,116</b>	<b>978</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>-12.4%</b>	<b>-13.9%</b>

**Table 36**




**DHR Hospitalizations**

Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	2	3	4	5	4	5	22.7%	25.0%
6 through 11	2	0	5	1	0	0	NA	NA
12 through 17	15	16	24	4	12	9	29.7%	-25.0%
18 and over	2	4	5	1	6	3	99.0%	-50.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>-22.7%</b>


**Table 38**

## DHR Addendum Subcategory Demographic Totals Gender




DHR Family Home Settings								
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	3,377	3,194	2,853	2,568	2,241	1,954	-10.3%	-12.8%
Female	3,295	3,203	2,911	2,717	2,307	2,068	-8.8%	-10.4%
Unknown	0	0	1	1	0	2	NA	NA
Total	6,672	6,397	5,765	5,286	4,548	4,024	-9.6%	-11.5%

**Table 39**




DHR Non-Community-Based Settings								
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	107	89	123	130	117	87	-1.7%	-25.6%
Female	5	6	1	2	6	9	57.3%	50.0%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	112	95	124	132	123	96	-1.4%	-22.0%

**Table 41**



DHR Community-Based Settings								
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	969	779	702	647	543	477	-13.1%	-12.2%
Female	680	542	468	469	435	365	-11.4%	-16.1%
Unknown	0	0	0	1	0	0	NA	NA
Total	6,672	6,397	5,765	5,286	4,548	4,024	-9.6%	-11.5%


**Table 40**



DHR Hospitalization Settings								
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	8	8	23	7	10	13	38.2%	30.0%
Female	13	15	15	4	12	4	15.1%	-66.7%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	21	23	38	11	22	17	16.2%	-22.7%


**Table 42**

## DHR Addendum Subcategory Demographic Totals Race




Race	1/31/ 2009	1/31/ 2010	1/31/ 2011	1/31/ 2012	1/31/ 2013	1/31/ 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	5	5	1	2	3	2	7.3%	-33.3%
Asian	13	12	14	13	11	14	2.7%	27.3%
Black or African American	4,845	4,588	3,931	3,479	2,866	2,466	-12.5%	-14.0%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	1	2	2	2	1	3	50.0%	200.0%
White	1,403	1,356	1,384	1,403	1,300	1,155	-3.7%	-11.2%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	234	250	227	212	188	188	-4.1%	0.0%
Other	93	113	120	112	86	82	-1.4%	-4.7%
Unknown	78	71	86	63	93	114	11.1%	22.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,672</b>	<b>6,397</b>	<b>5,765</b>	<b>5,286</b>	<b>4,548</b>	<b>4,024</b>	<b>-9.6%</b>	<b>-11.5%</b>

**Table 43**




Race	1/31/ 2009	1/31/ 2010	1/31/ 2011	1/31/ 2012	1/31/ 2013	1/31/ 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	2	1	1	0	0	1	NA	NA
Asian	9	8	10	6	3	5	-1.9%	66.7%
Black or African American	1,190	915	841	766	676	575	-13.4%	-14.9%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	2	2	1	1	1	0	-30.0%	-100.0%
White	369	318	267	284	248	222	-9.3%	-10.5%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	42	33	26	35	32	23	-8.9%	-28.1%
Other	20	17	11	17	12	11	-6.7%	-8.3%
Unknown	15	27	13	7	6	5	-9.8%	-16.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,649</b>	<b>1,321</b>	<b>1,170</b>	<b>1,116</b>	<b>978</b>	<b>842</b>		<b>-13.9%</b>

**Table 44**



Race	1/31/ 2009	1/31/ 2010	1/31/ 2011	1/31/ 2012	1/31/ 2013	1/31/ 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	2	0	1	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	1	1	0	0	0	2	NA	NA
Black or African American	216	217	213	200	187	179	-1.5%	-4.3%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	94	107	74	81	75	74	-4.9%	-1.3%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	20	13	10	14	9	11	-17.0%	22.2%
Other	2	0	6	3	8	5	NA	-37.5%
Unknown	0	1	2	1	0	1	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>-3.0%</b>	<b>-2.5%</b>


**Table 45**



Race	1/31/ 2009	1/31/ 2010	1/31/ 2011	1/31/ 2012	1/31/ 2013	1/31/ 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	1	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Black or African American	10	12	15	5	14	10	26.0%	-28.6%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	1	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	8	7	15	5	8	5	11.5%	-37.5%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	2	1	7	1	0	2	NA	NA
Other	1	1	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Unknown	0	0	1	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>-22.7%</b>


**Table 46**

## DHR Addendum Subcategory Out-of-State One-Day Census Trends Placement Trends




DHR Out-of-State Family Home Trends								
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Adoptive Care	14	10	9	7	1	2	-9.3%	100.0%
Foster Care	102	83	53	34	24	23	-24.8%	-4.2%
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	41	22	26	23	27	21	-8.9%	-22.2%
Restrictive Relative (Kinship) Care	70	63	44	25	19	11	-29.9%	-42.1%
Treatment Foster Care	6	9	9	6	2	2	-10.0%	0.0%
Living Arrangement - Family Home	4	0	0	2	16	14	NA	-12.5%
All Categories	237	187	141	97	89	73	-20.6%	-18.0%

**Table 47**



DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Trends								
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	0	0	0	0	1	0	NA	-100.0%
Residential Child Care Program	65	47	44	38	42	45	-6.0%	7.1%
Community Supported Living Arrangement	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Community-Based	2	1	1	1	11	7	182.7%	-36.4%
Total	67	48	45	39	54	52	-2.6%	-3.7%

**Table 48**




DHR Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Trends								
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Residential Educational Facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Residential Treatment Centers	0	0	1	3	5	11	3.3%	120.0%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	0	0	0	0	4	2	1.0%	-50.0%
All Categories	0	0	1	3	9	13	NA	44.4%

**Table 49**


## DHR Addendum Subcategory Out-of-State Demographic Comparisons

**Age**



DHR Out-of-State Family Home Age Trends								
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	89	68	44	28	29	36	-13.5%	24.1%
6 through 11	67	42	29	22	24	9	-29.2%	-62.5%
12 through 17	66	64	56	37	23	14	-25.3%	-39.1%
18 and over	15	13	12	10	13	14	0.0%	7.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>-20.6%</b>	<b>-18.0%</b>


**Table 50**



DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Age Trends								
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	0	1	1	2	1	NA	-50.0%
12 through 17	32	18	23	18	22	20	-4.9%	-9.1%
18 and over	35	30	21	20	30	31	0.9%	3.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>-2.6%</b>	<b>-3.7%</b>


**Table 51**

**Gender**



DHR Out-of-State Family Home Gender Trends								
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	110	95	70	46	40	35	-20.0%	-12.5%
Female	127	92	71	51	49	38	-21.0%	-22.4%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>-20.6%</b>	<b>-18.0%</b>

**Table 52**





DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Gender Trends								
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	44	28	29	25	30	32	-4.0%	6.7%
Female	23	20	16	14	24	20	1.8%	-16.7%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>-2.6%</b>	<b>-3.7%</b>

**Table 53**

## DHR Addendum

### Subcategory Out-of-State Demographic Comparisons

#### Race




DHR Out-of-State Family Home Race Trends								
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	1	1	1	0	0	0	NA	NA
Black or African American	150	119	92	63	54	35	NA	-35.2%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	75	58	40	28	30	27	-35.3%	-10.0%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	5	7	8	4	2	3	-27.5%	50.0%
Other	3	0	0	1	1	6	NA	500.0%
Unknown	3	2	0	1	2	2	NA	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>-33.2%</b>	<b>-18.0%</b>

**Table 54**

DHR Out-of-State Community-Based Race Trends								
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	1	1	1	0	1	0	NA	-100.0%
Black or African American	26	24	26	21	31	29	4.5%	-6.5%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	34	21	17	16	19	19	-8.9%	0.0%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	4	0	1	2	3	4	NA	33.3%
Other	2	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Unknown	0	2	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>-2.6%</b>	<b>-3.7%</b>


**Table 55**

## DHR Addendum Subcategory Cost Comparisons Total Costs and Per Bed-Day




DHR Family Home Total Costs							
FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
\$145,335,272	\$148,811,233	\$131,576,951	\$125,716,002	\$117,085,829	\$116,053,950	-4.3%	-0.9%

Table 56




DHR Community-Based Total Costs							
FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
\$156,230,898	\$115,833,310	\$93,862,099	\$89,645,537	\$82,856,211	\$78,813,615	-14.2%	-7.6%

Table 58



DHR Family Home Costs Per Bed-Day (Residential Only)							
FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
\$87	\$92	\$88	\$93	\$99	\$111	5.2%	11.9%

Table 57



DHR Community-Based Costs Per Bed-Day (Residential Only)							
FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
\$281	\$250	\$229	\$234	\$244	\$278	-3.3%	4.3%

Table 59

## **Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) Summary**

---

---

DJS has in recent years focused on reducing the time youth who have been committed by the juvenile court to out-of-home placement must stay in detention centers prior to placement. Central to these efforts is making sure that placement decisions are made in a timely, structured, and informed manner, and that youth are ultimately placed into programs meeting both security and treatment needs, to confirm a successful placement that does not result in a removal back to detention. At the same time, DJS has worked to ensure that those placement options are available by increasing the number of in-home slots for lower-risk youth and more secure placement options for higher-risk youth. Initiatives include:

### More structured risk and needs assessments

Assessment and treatment planning policies have been refined to better capture the specific treatment needs of each youth, and to structure and guide the placement and case-management processes. The Maryland Comprehensive Assessment and Services Planning (MCASP) has been in place since FY2010 to guide case-forwarding and case-management decisions based on structured risk and needs assessments.

### Increased capacity and use of in-home evidence-based programs for lower-risk youth

These programs are meant for youth who are at risk of out-of-home placement, but can be kept at home with intensive family-based services. In prior years such youth may have been placed in group homes or other community-based residential programs, due more to family and home issues than to significant risk to public safety. Since these in-home evidence-based programs (including Functional Family Therapy and Multisystemic Therapy) have been available, DJS use of family home settings (mainly Treatment Foster Care), and community-based residential programs (mainly Group Homes and Therapeutic Group Homes) has declined, as lower-risk youth are kept home.

### Increased capacity for non-community-based residential programs for higher-risk youth

DJS has in recent years increased capacity to serve higher-risk youth who may have in previous years been either placed in out-of-State non-community-based placements or in Maryland non-secure community-based residential programs - often with unsuccessful outcomes. These secure placements are available at the State-run Victor Cullen Center, the J. DeWeese Carter Center, the Western Maryland Youth Centers, the William Donald Schaefer House, and the privately-run Silver Oak Academy. Thus, the decline in family home setting and community-based residential placements over the past few years can also be attributed to this increase in more secure slots, as higher-risk youth are more appropriately placed. One of the drivers of pending-placement populations has been the youth who had been placed into non-secure programs, only to be sent back to detention from programs that were not equipped to manage behavior.

### Legislative changes allowing for rapid administrative transfer of committed youth

Statutory changes passed during the 2012 legislative session give DJS the ability to move youth from placements that are not working out to different committed programs of either equal or higher security without need for a new court hearing. The Continuum of Care statute<sup>10</sup> now allows DJS (through its new Central Review Committee) to review and, as necessary, quickly move such youth to more secure non-community-based residential programs that are better able to meet the security and treatment needs of the youth. This reduces the need for many youth to be sent back to detention pending a court hearing, and can reduce time in detention for youth that have been ejected. Having more programming capacity at the non-community-based residential placement level is key to the success of this initiative.

### Restructuring the placement decision process for youth at risk of out-of-home placement


The Multi-disciplinary Assessment Staffing Team (MAST) process - an enriched multi-disciplinary process, intended to develop comprehensive individualized plans for youth who are removed from home, and to match youth with the right programs and services so that youth will be successful - was implemented across the State in FY2014. This process has shown initial success at moving youth more quickly through the placement decision process, thus reducing the time youth spend in detention centers prior to placement.

### Streamlining placement process for out-of-State placements

A large portion of secure placement options for committed youth continues to be in out-of-State programs, and the placement process for these youth has often led to long stays in detention for youth requiring secure placement. Youth being placed in out-of-State placements were previously required to be reviewed by the State Coordinating Council (SCC). Following legislation passed in 2011, the SCC has reevaluated and restructured the way it reviews the information on out-of-State placements in accordance with the 2008 Interagency Strategic Plan. The SCC notification form has also been streamlined to ensure that the SCC process does not interfere with placing a youth into the most appropriate placement possible based on individual needs. DJS developed a checklist and tip-sheet for DJS personnel to use which structured and streamlined internal processes. Once it is determined that in-State options have been exhausted, no out-of-State placement for a youth should be delayed due to incorrect or incomplete administrative requirements.


---

<sup>10</sup> Maryland Annotated Code, Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article, §3-8A-19.



Category	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	238	268	237	254	254	258	2.4%	1.6%
Family Home Settings	83	93	75	73	71	90	3.5%	26.8%
Hospitalization	8	8	5	7	9	8	5.0%	-11.1%
Non-Community Base Residential Placement	556	562	630	623	614	525	-1.0%	-14.5%
Placement Category Not Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
All Categories	885	931	947	957	948	881	0.0%	-7.1%

Table 60



Category	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Average Change
Family Home	210	210	208	173	184	206	0.1%
Community-Based	902	783	692	688	694	631	-6.7%
Non-Community Based	1,915	1,922	1,883	2,070	2,005	1,592	-3.1%
Hospitalization	73	70	84	74	96	88	5.1%
Not Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Total	3,100	2,985	2,867	3,005	2,979	2,517	-3.8%

Table 61

## DJS Trends in Out-of-Home Placement

Maryland has seen a sharp decline in the number of juvenile cases referred to DJS Intake in recent years. Since FY2009 the number of complaints referred to DJS declined 48%. This reduction in cases coming to the DJS “front door” has slowly rippled through the system in recent years. Detention populations have begun to decline, though at a slower rate than Intakes: down 36% since FY2009. Cases supervised in the community by DJS caseworkers have declined, with probation orders down 48% since FY2009. This declining trend has just begun to be reflected in the committed out-of-home population. Table 62 shows a three-year change in end of Fiscal Year population of 24%. Much of this decline occurred in the final quarter of FY2014. It is too early to tell if this decline will be sustained in FY2015. Declines in committed population, though evenly distributed by gender, are not evenly distributed by race. While the committed population of white youth declined 12.5%, the drop was just 2.9% for youth of color. The Department has recently partnered with the Annie E. Casey Foundation to study the

way youth are committed to out-of-home placements in Maryland, and to better understand how decisions made throughout the juvenile justice system can impact these racial disparities.


A large portion of secure placement options for committed youth continues to be in out-of-State programs. The population of youth placed out of State has also begun to decline in FY2014, averaging under 100 youth for the first time in five years.

DJS Population Flow (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
2013	950	2,029	2,979	2,049	930
2014	810	1,707	2,517	1,778	739
Three-Year Change	-8.1%	-14.0%	-12.2%	-6.1%	-24.0%
Average Yearly Change	0.2%	-3.7%	-3.1%	-3.0%	-2.9%
Recent Year Change	-14.7%	-15.9%	-15.5%	-13.2%	-20.5%

Table 62


DJS 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	Out-of-State	Unknown	
Allegany	19	2.2%	11	0	2	2	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	101	11.5%	10	1	15	12	0	0	11	0	0	4	9	9	1	0	1	6	5	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	9	0	
Baltimore	65	7.4%	9	0	11	5	0	0	4	0	0	1	4	11	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	13	0	
Baltimore City	164	18.6%	10	0	30	13	0	0	15	0	0	4	16	9	0	3	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	0	34	0	
Calvert	17	1.9%	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	
Caroline	1	0.1%	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	
Carroll	20	2.3%	5	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	
Cecil	13	1.5%	0	0	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Charles	23	2.6%	2	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	
Dorchester	11	1.2%	0	0	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	
Frederick	18	2.0%	4	0	4	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	5	0.6%	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Harford	25	2.8%	2	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	
Howard	14	1.6%	2	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	
Kent	4	0.5%	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	
Montgomery	57	6.5%	13	0	6	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	12	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	5	0	
Prince George's	182	20.7%	26	0	24	14	1	0	17	0	0	3	19	19	0	1	7	9	5	0	0	0	0	13	4	0	17	0	
Queen Anne's	2	0.2%	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	
Somerset	7	0.8%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	
St. Mary's	13	1.5%	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	
Talbot	7	0.8%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	
Washington	24	2.7%	7	0	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	57	6.5%	3	0	15	4	0	2	2	0	0	6	0	3	0	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	2	0	
Worcester	6	0.7%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	
Out-of-State	26	3.0%	1	0	7	3	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	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	881	100.0	115	0	150	84	2	5	58	0	0	29	70	68	1	4	19	59	1	0	0	0	0	61	36	0	96	0	
% of children from jurisdiction			57.9%	1.0%	16.9%	7.9%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.1%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.5%	21.1%	0.0%	26.9%	0.0%	
% children Statewide in all			13.1%	0.0%	17.0%	9.5%	0.2%	0.6%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	7.9%	7.7%	0.1%	0.5%	2.2%	6.7%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	4.1%	0.0%	10.9%	0.0%	

Table 63



DJS Total Cost								
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$21,242,760	\$24,592,016	\$23,676,804	\$21,634,051	\$26,725,210	\$21,828,389	1.7%	-18.3%
Family Home Settings	\$4,679,628	\$5,717,155	\$4,575,954	\$4,517,994	\$5,329,639	\$6,278,370	7.3%	17.8%
Hospitalization	\$110,292	\$97,064	\$28,977	\$14,946	\$41,220	\$19,652	-1.4%	-52.3%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	\$48,362,284	\$45,458,947	\$48,695,167	\$59,475,243	\$56,581,033	\$64,467,134	6.5%	13.9%
Not Available	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
All Categories	\$74,394,964	\$75,865,182	\$76,976,902	\$85,642,234	\$88,677,102	\$92,593,545	4.5%	4.4%

Table 64



DJS Costs Per Bed Day								
Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Community-Based Residential Placement	\$191	\$225	\$225	\$233	\$251	\$235	4.9%	-4.4%
Family Home Settings	\$274	\$177	\$271	\$184	\$206	\$231	-2.0%	-7.8%
Hospitalization	\$140	\$141	\$99	\$168	\$118	\$1	-17.7%	-99.4%
Non-Community Based Residential Placement	\$244	\$349	\$243	\$329	\$281	\$281	5.4%	-6.4%
Not Available	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All Categories	\$227	\$279	\$239	\$287	\$266	\$187	-2.7%	-35.0%

Table 65

## DJS Recommendations

The Continuum of Care statute should be maintained to ensure that DJS continues to have the ability to quickly move youth as necessary from committed placements that are not working out, without need for further court action. This will permit DJS to continue to leverage current resources and to strengthen the DJS Continuum of Care to best serve youth committed to DJS for treatment and rehabilitation by:


- Eliminating a youth's time in detention when a youth is ejected from a residential placement. Youth do not receive treatment services while awaiting placement in detention.
- Reducing the likelihood a youth will be released from pending placement without the benefit of treatment when s/he remains in pending placement for long periods of time.
- Decreasing the overall length of time the youth stays in committed status with DJS, by allowing DJS to swiftly address treatment concerns and issues without the youth being placed in detention.

The Continuum of Care legislation has a significant impact on DJS operations. The implementation of this legislation has led to a sustained reduction of youth pending placement in detention centers and has improved the youth's ability to receive the required treatment services.

The Legislature should continue to support DJS capital projects to ensure that DJS has access to adequate capacity to serve the diverse needs of the youth that require an out-of-home placement.


DJS is participating on a subcommittee of the Interagency Rate-Setting Committee (IRC) to evaluate the current rate-setting process for residential child care programs. The subcommittee is exploring ways in which the process can: a) allow for flexibility and innovation in order to meet the needs of children placed in out-of-home care; and b) establish a link between the rate and performance-based outcomes of the program and of children served.

## DJS Addendum Subcategory One-Day Census Totals Placement Trends




DJS Family Home Settings Placement Trends								
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Adoptive Care	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Foster Care	5	7	7	6	5	4	-2.2%	-20.0%
Formal Relative (Kinship) Care	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Restrictive Relative (Kinship) Care	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Treatment Foster Care	78	86	68	67	66	86	3.3%	30.3%
Living Arrangement - Family Home	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>26.8%</b>

Table 66



DJS Community-Based Trends								
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	16	20	20	16	18	13	-2.1%	-27.8%
Residential Child Care Programs	222	248	217	238	236	221	0.3%	-6.4%
Community Supported Living Arrangement (CSLA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - CB	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>-7.9%</b>


Table 67



DJS Non-Community Placement Trends								
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	9	12	15	14	25	24	25.2%	-4.0%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	178	180	178	167	185	159	-1.9%	-14.1%
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	28	21	23	38	39	41	11.5%	5.1%
Residential Educational Facilities	1	1	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	156	156	180	155	153	141	-1.5%	-7.8%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	184	192	234	249	212	184	0.9%	-13.2%
Living Arrangement - Non-CB	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>623</b>	<b>614</b>	<b>549</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>-10.6%</b>


Table 68

## DJS Addendum Subcategory Totals Demographic Comparisons Age




DJS Family Home Settings Age Trends								
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	0	0	0	1	1	NA	0.0%
12 through 17	47	60	42	33	34	46	2.9%	35.3%
18 and over	36	33	33	40	36	43	4.5%	19.4%
Total	83	93	75	73	71	90	2.8%	26.8%

**Table 69**



DJS Non-Community-Based Settings Age Trends								
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	1	1	1	3	1	NA	-66.7%
12 through 17	442	428	466	488	482	435	-0.1%	-9.8%
18 and over	114	133	163	134	129	113	1.1%	-12.4%
Total	556	562	630	623	614	549	0.0%	-10.6%


**Table 71**



DJS Community-Based Settings Age Trends								
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
12 through 17	192	211	174	196	195	162	1.1%	-0.5%
18 and over	46	57	63	58	59	72	7.1%	1.7%
Total	238	268	237	254	254	234	2.1%	0.0%


**Table 70**

## DJS Addendum Subcategory Totals Demographic Comparisons Gender




DJS Family Home Settings Gender Trends								
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	66	68	57	52	54	62	-0.7%	14.8%
Female	17	25	18	21	17	28	16.3%	64.7%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	83	93	75	73	71	90	2.8%	26.8%

Table 72



DJS Non-Community-Based Gender Trends								
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	502	506	575	565	545	490	-0.2%	-10.1%
Female	54	56	55	58	69	59	2.4%	-14.5%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	556	562	630	623	614	549	0.0%	-10.6%


Table 74



DJS Community-Based Gender Trends								
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	191	213	189	197	194	183	-0.5%	-5.7%
Female	47	55	48	57	60	51	2.7%	-15.0%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	238	268	237	254	254	234	0.1%	0.0%


Table 73

## DJS Addendum Subcategory Totals Demographic Comparisons Race




Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	1	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Black or African American	54	62	47	43	37	57	4.4%	54.1%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	24	25	23	25	31	29	4.5%	-6.5%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	4	4	5	4	3	4	2.7%	33.3%
Unknown	1	1	0	1	0	0	NA	NA
Total	83	93	75	73	71	90	2.8%	26.8%

Table 75



Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	1	1	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	2	1	3	0	2	1	NA	-50.0%
Black or African American	383	398	456	450	450	399	1.2%	-11.3%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	154	132	143	151	131	113	-5.5%	-13.7%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	14	25	24	22	31	27	18.8%	-12.9%
Unknown	2	5	4	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	556	562	630	623	614	540	-0.3%	-12.1%


Table 77



Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	1	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	1	1	0	0	2	1	NA	-50.0%
Black or African American	169	205	182	185	168	165	0.2%	-1.8%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	60	54	42	60	66	53	0.2%	-19.7%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	7	7	11	9	18	15	24.5%	-16.7%
Unknown	0	1	2	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	238	268	237	254	254	234	0.1%	-7.9%

Table 76

## DJS Addendum Subcategory Out-of-State One-Day Census Totals




DJS Out of State Non-Community-Based Placement Trends								
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	1	2	5	0	0	0	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	28	19	28	38	30	30	6.0%	0.0%
Residential Educational Facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	32	21	23	18	26	21	-4.3%	-19.2%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs	51	53	68	76	67	45	-0.1%	-32.8%
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>-1.4%</b>	<b>-22.0%</b>

Table 78

## DJS Addendum Subcategory Out-of-State Demographic Comparison


### Age



DJS Out of State Non-Community-Based Age Trends								
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
12 through 17	78	59	79	88	79	62	-2.2%	-21.5%
18 and over	34	36	45	44	44	34	1.2%	-22.7%
Total	112	95	124	132	123	96	-1.4%	-22.0%

**Table 79**


### Race



DJS Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Race Trends								
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	1	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	2	0	1	0	0	0	NA	NA
Black or African American	92	78	104	119	107	87	0.8%	-18.7%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	17	12	12	8	10	6	-15.5%	-40.0%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	1	4	6	5	6	3	60.7%	-50.0%
Unknown	0	0	1	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	112	95	124	132	123	96	-1.4%	-22.0%

**Table 81**


### Gender



DJS Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Gender Trends								
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	107	89	123	130	117	87	-1.7%	-25.6%
Female	5	6	1	2	6	9	57.3%	50.0%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	112	95	124	132	123	96	-1.4%	-22.0%


**Table 80**

## DJS Addendum Subcategory Cost Comparison Total Costs




DJS Family Home Total Costs								
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Foster Care	\$87,217	\$108,702	\$94,347	\$85,937	\$83,656	\$55,821	-6.7%	-33.3%
Treatment Foster Care	\$4,592,411	\$5,608,453	\$4,481,607	\$4,432,057	\$5,245,983	\$6,082,517	7.0%	15.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,679,628</b>	<b>\$5,717,155</b>	<b>\$4,575,954</b>	<b>\$4,517,994</b>	<b>\$5,329,639</b>	<b>\$6,138,338</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>15.2%</b>

**Table 82**



DJS Community Based Total Costs								
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	\$2,735,959	\$1,423,270	\$2,879,310	\$2,197,844	\$1,314,246	\$1,187,123	-3.8%	-9.7%
Residential Child Care Programs	\$18,506,801	\$23,168,746	\$20,797,494	\$19,436,207	\$25,410,964	\$19,687,564	3.3%	-22.5%
Community Supported Living Arrangement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - CB	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$21,242,760</b>	<b>\$24,592,016</b>	<b>\$23,676,804</b>	<b>\$21,634,051</b>	<b>\$26,725,210</b>	<b>\$20,874,687</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>-21.9%</b>


**Table 83**



DJS Non-Community Based Total Costs								
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	\$257,615	\$469,239	\$772,896	\$539,495	\$1,303,799	\$1,167,096	49.6%	-10.5%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	\$26,032,363	\$24,558,746	\$25,367,344	\$27,630,982	\$26,831,507	\$31,578,635	4.3%	17.7%
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	\$5,536,334	\$4,742,328	\$5,919,055	\$7,787,834	\$9,910,700	\$4,472,218	2.9%	-54.9%
Residential Educational Facilities	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	\$9,674,065	\$9,913,715	\$10,433,639	\$9,344,675	\$10,814,084	\$2,626,588	-12.5%	-75.7%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	\$6,861,907	\$5,774,919	\$6,202,233	\$14,172,257	\$7,720,944	\$5,526,535	9.2%	-28.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$48,362,284</b>	<b>\$45,458,947</b>	<b>\$48,695,167</b>	<b>\$59,475,243</b>	<b>\$56,581,033</b>	<b>\$45,371,072</b>	<b>-0.3%</b>	<b>-19.8%</b>


**Table 84**

## DJS Addendum Subcategory Cost Comparison Per Bed-Day




DJS Family Home Costs Per Bed-Day								
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Foster Care	\$34	\$45	\$38	\$41	\$44	\$33	1.5%	-25.0%
Treatment Foster Care	\$317	\$188	\$310	\$198	\$219	\$198	-2.1%	-9.5%
Total	\$274	\$177	\$271	\$184	\$206	\$231	1.9%	12.2%

**Table 85**



DJS Community Based Costs Per Bed-Day								
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	\$571	\$195	\$491	\$223	\$210	\$235	7.5%	12.1%
Residential Child Care Programs	\$174	\$227	\$210	\$234	\$254	\$240	7.5%	-5.4%
Community Supported Living Arrangement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - CB	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Total	\$233	\$233	\$225	\$233	\$251	\$235	0.3%	-6.4%



**Table 86**



DJS Non-Community Based Costs Per Bed-Day								
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	\$133	\$423	\$205	\$238	\$203	\$147	27.9%	-27.4%
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	\$335	\$334	\$380	\$347	\$384	\$533	10.8%	38.6%
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	\$470	\$593	\$471	\$470	\$347	\$1,127	40.8%	225.2%
Residential Educational Facilities	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	\$188	\$535	\$161	\$562	\$195	\$58	45.5%	-70.2%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM)	\$123	\$201	\$118	\$216	\$190	\$99	8.9%	-47.8%
Total	\$244	\$349	\$243	\$329	\$281	\$327	10.0%	16.2%

**Table 87**

## DJS Addendum Subcategory Out-of-State Cost Comparison



DJS Out-of-State Non-Community Based Total Costs								
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	\$228,038	\$390,037	\$474,781	\$233,070	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	\$3,111,076	\$1,980,475	\$3,628,879	\$5,062,804	\$9,129,507	\$4,405,939	21.6%	-51.7%
Residential Educational Facilities	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	\$2,271,162	\$3,126,830	\$3,317,929	\$2,115,372	\$3,114,182	\$2,207,451	2.2%	-2.19%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs	\$3,729,449	\$3,270,341	\$3,892,799	\$5,748,018	\$528,718	\$4,206,920	106.6%	569.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$9,339,725</b>	<b>\$8,767,683</b>	<b>\$11,314,388</b>	<b>\$13,159,265</b>	<b>\$12,772,406</b>	<b>\$10,820,310</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>-14.9%</b>

**Table 88**


DJS Out-of-State Non-Community Based Costs Per Bed Day								
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	\$500	\$362	\$294	\$281	NA	NA	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	\$333	\$359	\$373	\$390	\$361	\$341	0.6%	-5.5%
Residential Educational Facilities	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	\$411	\$357	\$268	\$383	\$438	\$241	-5.2%	-44.9%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs	\$196	\$180	\$192	\$232	\$240	\$210	2.1%	-12.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$272</b>	<b>\$261</b>	<b>\$257</b>	<b>\$298</b>	<b>\$369</b>	<b>\$264</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>-28.4%</b>

**Table 89**

## Developmental Disabilities Administration (DDA) Summary

DDA provides a coordinated service delivery system oriented toward the goal of integrating individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities into the community. DDA services are provided through a wide array of community-based services delivered primarily through a network of licensed providers. In addition to adults, DDA makes these services available to children residing in out-of-home placements and in their family homes. When children reside in out-of-home placements, they should receive all appropriate entitlement services prior to accessing DDA funds for services. In FY2014, DDA provided funding for out-of-home services to a total of 128 children, a decrease of 14.7% from FY2013.

DDA considers families and caregivers to be the primary supports for children with intellectual and developmental disabilities, and believes they should have an integral role in children's care. DDA recognizes that families and caregivers have unique and varied needs, and may need assistance from both formal and informal networks to provide their children with the support to reach their full potential as they grow up.




DDA Placement Trends								
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	6	12	9	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Child Care Programs	7	0	2	11	22	17	NA	-22.7%
Community-Supported Living Arrangement (CSLA)	135	117	96	84	81	68	-12.7%	-16.0%
Living Arrangement - Community Based	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>-10.0%</b>	<b>-17.5%</b>

Table 90

Table 90 shows a one-day count of DDA's out-of-home placements on January 31<sup>st</sup> of each year from 2009 through 2014. In FY2014, the one day count of Community-Supported Living Arrangements (CSLA) services decreased by 16.0%, and the one-day count of children receiving DDA Residential Child Care Program (RCCP) services declined by 22.7%. CSLA services are provided for the majority of children (68 of 85 individuals) that DDA serves in out-of-home placements. CSLA services enable individuals to live in their own homes, apartments, family homes, or rental units by providing supervision and other necessary interventions, thus allowing individuals to remain near friends, members of their family, their local areas, and other known supports.

RCCP services are provided by DDA-licensed providers, and include Group Homes and Alternative Living Units. Group Homes are residences owned, leased, or operated by a DDA

licensee that provide specialized residential services to at least 4 but not more than 8 individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Alternative Living Units are residences owned or leased by DDA licensees that provide specialized residential services to no more than 3 individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities.



DDA Total Served								
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Family Home	1	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Community-Based	192	169	152	173	150	128	-7.2%	-14.7%
Total	193	169	152	173	150	128	-7.3%	-14.7%

Table 91

Table 91 shows the number of children receiving out-of-home services in FY 2014 has decreased by 14.7% from FY 2013.

DDA Population Flow						
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
2013		102	48	150	28	122
2014		92	36	128	27	101
Three-Year Change		-20.7%	0.0%	-15.8%	-3.6%	-18.5%
Average Yearly Change		-9.1%	12.2%	-6.1%	-0.8%	-7.2%
Recent Year Change		-9.8%	-25.0%	-14.7%	-3.6%	-17.2%

Table 92


DDA is committed to individualized, flexible, family-centered, and family-directed services, and whenever possible attempts to place children in their home jurisdiction. If placement in the home jurisdiction cannot occur, DDA collaborates with other agencies such as DHR, MSDE, and the DHMH Behavioral Health Administration (BHA), responsible for the welfare of children through interagency and intra-agency boards, coordinating councils, committees, and task forces at the State and local levels. These collaborations help to ensure that services are coordinated and entities utilize all appropriate resources for the 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.

DDA Placement by Jurisdiction on 1/31/2014																													
Jurisdiction Where Children Are 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	Out-of-State	Unknown-	
Allegany	3	4.1%	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	
Anne Arundel	2	2.7%	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	
Baltimore	8	11.0%	0	0	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore City	3	4.1%	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	2	2.7%	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	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	6	8.2%	0	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	
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	2	2.7%	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	0	0.0%	0	0	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	1.4%	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	
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	1.4%	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	
Howard	3	4.1%	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	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	26	35.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	11	15.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	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	1.4%	0	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	
St. Mary's	1	1.4%	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	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	4.1%	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	0	0.0%	0	0	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	
Out-of-State	0	0.0%	0	0	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	73	100.0%	3	2	6	4	2	0	7	0	2	0	1	0	1	3	0	26	11	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	
% of children from jurisdiction			100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children Statewide in all			4.1%	2.7%	8.2%	5.5%	2.7%	0.0%	9.6%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	1.4%	4.1%	0.0%	35.6%	15.1%	0.0%	1.4%	1.4%	0.0%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 93

As indicated in Table 92, the total number of placements at the start of each fiscal year has declined 20.7% over the past three years. The number of new placements in DDA services from FY2013 to FY2014 decreased by 25%. The total number of placements by DDA in out-of-home placements in FY2014 was 128, 14.7% lower than in FY2013. This table shows the number of placements and not the number of children. In some instances, a child will have more than one placement due to hospitalization, reunification, or move to a new setting.


Of the 73 children receiving out-of-home placement services on January 31, 2014, all but two were placed in their local jurisdiction. Jurisdictions with larger percentages of children in out-of-home placements are consistent with the population of those jurisdictions as indicated in Table 93.



DDA Total Cost								
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Residential Child Care Program	\$2,464,420	\$2,027,781	\$1,848,389	\$3,029,693	\$2,908,846	\$2,272,657	2.3%	-21.9%
Community Supported Living Arrangement (CSLA)	\$3,531,772	\$3,307,332	\$2,823,561	\$2,843,317	\$3,259,484	\$2,823,561	-3.8%	-13.4%
Total	\$5,996,192	\$5,335,113	\$4,671,950	\$5,873,011	\$6,168,330	\$5,096,218	-2.0%	-17.4%

Table 94

While the cost per bed-day for RCCP services dropped slightly in the past year, it is still over four times more costly than providing out-of-home placement services through CSLA. Over the past six years there has been a slight increase in the cost of CSLA services, but it still remains the more cost-effective model for providing services. The total costs of DDA out-of-home placements have dropped by 17.4%. This is influenced by the decrease in the cost per bed-day as well as the number of children in DDA out-of-home placements.



DDA Cost Per Bed Day								
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Residential Child Care Program	\$365	\$319	\$324	\$353	\$321	\$304	-3.3%	-5.2%
Community-Supported Living Arrangement (CSLA)	\$68	\$73	\$72	\$87	\$95	\$72	2.4%	-23.9%
Total	\$102	\$103	\$105	\$142	\$142	\$188	14.1%	32.0%

Table 95

## DDA Recommendations


The greatest challenge to the DDA system continues to be the identification and support of children between the ages of 18 and 21 who are aging out of other support systems and agencies within the State. It is critical to identify these children early to allow for thorough, effective transition planning. Incompatible data systems between State agencies and confidentiality issues create barriers to the process. Recent efforts to improve communication and collaboration through inter-agency and intra-agency boards, coordinating councils, committee, and task forces at State and local levels have been helpful in identifying some of these children earlier to allow for smoother transition to adult services. DDA and DHR currently have a comprehensive memorandum of understanding that has enabled DDA to improve the planning process for youth transitioning out of the DHR system.

DDA will continue to work with community resources and other State agencies to enable 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 intellectual and developmental disabilities and their families. Ongoing needs may include medical or behavioral services, specialized childcare, respite, and supports for siblings and caregivers.

DDA will continue to explore needs and the development of resources that will allow families to support their children with disabilities in their homes. DDA remains committed to focusing on supporting families.

## DDA Addendum Subcategory Totals Demographic Comparisons

### Age




**DDA Age Trends**

Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	1	1	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	13	9	6	6	10	6	-7.5%	-40.0%
12 through 17	69	53	43	37	30	28	-16.3%	-6.7%
18 and over	65	66	58	52	63	51	-3.8%	-19.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>-10.0%</b>	<b>-17.5%</b>

**Table 96**

### Gender




**DDA Gender Trends**

Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	93	82	65	62	67	54	-9.7%	-19.4%
Female	55	47	42	33	36	31	-10.3%	-13.9%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>-10.0%</b>	<b>-17.5%</b>

**Table 97**

### Race




**DDA Race Trends**

Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	1	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	1	1	1	1	2	3	30.0%	50.0%
Black or African American	32	33	26	21	31	26	-1.2%	-16.1%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	46	32	26	28	35	31	-5.6%	-11.4%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	1	2	2	NA	0.0%
Other	50	45	36	25	24	19	17.1%	-20.8%
Unknown	18	18	18	19	9	4	20.5%	-55.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>-17.5%</b>

**Table 98**

## DDA Addendum

### Subcategory Out-of-State One-Day Census Totals



DDA OOS								
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Independent Living Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Child Care Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Community-Supported Living Arrangement	1	1	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Community-Based	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	1	1	0	0	0	0	NA	NA


**Table 99**

## Behavioral Health Administration (BHA) Summary

Effective July 1, 2014, within DHMH, the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration (ADAA) merged with the Mental Hygiene Administration (MHA) to form the Behavioral Health Administration (BHA). To ensure consistency with previous reports, this year's report will consider placement data from ADAA and MHA separately.

### Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration (ADAA)


As of January 1, 2015, virtually all data reporting by substance-related-disorder-treatment providers will go through the Administrative Services Organization (ASO), Value Options. In anticipation of that major changeover, some treatment providers became less than completely compliant with SMART<sup>11</sup> reporting requirements. This affects the data reported in the Out-of-Home Placement Report in two ways - incomplete reporting of treatment admissions or entries depresses the one-day totals, while incomplete reporting of discharges or exits from treatment tends to artificially inflate one-day totals. Estimated costs were also affected. With these reporting issues, the reporting and analysis for this year's out-of-home placements was more challenging than usual. Next year, all reporting for DHMH behavioral health will be through Value Options and accuracy and completeness should improve.



ADAA Placement Trends								
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Educational Facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs	181	208	204	180	175	175	-0.3%	0.0%
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>-0.3%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

Table 100

<sup>11</sup> Strengthening Medicare and Repaying Taxpayers (SMART) Act, H.R. 1845, January 10, 2013.



ADA Total Served								
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Non-Community Based	2,275	2,577	2,484	2,370	2,188	1,922	-3.0%	-12.2%
Total	2,275	2,577	2,484	2,370	2,188	1,922	-3.0%	-12.2%


Table 101

ADAA Placement Population Flow (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	
2013	180	2,008	2,188	2,012	176	
2014	181	1,741	1,922	1,626	246	
Three-Year Change	-10.0%	-23.7%	-22.6%	-27.6%	3.8%	
Average Yearly Change	-2.3%	-7.4%	-7.0%	-8.8%	7.5%	
Recent Year Change	0.6%	-13.3%	-12.2%	-19.2%	39.8%	

Table 102


ADAA 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	Out-of-State	Unknown
Allegany	2	1.0%	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	0
Anne Arundel	33	16.8%	9	7	7	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	27	13.8%	6	0	11	1	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	39	19.9%	1	1	9	11	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Calvert	6	3.1%	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	1	0.5%	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	9	4.6%	2	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	8	4.1%	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Charles	4	2.0%	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Frederick	8	4.1%	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	11	5.6%	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Howard	3	1.5%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	2	1.0%	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	0
Montgomery	13	6.6%	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	4	2.0%	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
Queen Anne's	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
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	1.0%	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
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	7	3.6%	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	3	1.5%	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
Worcester	1	0.5%	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
Out-of-State	11	5.6%	0	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	196	100.0	42	13	50	14	2	0	34	0	2	4	6	0	1	0	3	6	2	0	0	1	0	14	0	2	0	0
% of children from jurisdiction			100.0	21.2%	40.7%	28.2%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	50.0%	00.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	30.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children Statewide in all			21.4%	6.6%	25.5%	7.1%	1.0%	0.0%	17.3%	0.0%	1.0%	2.0%	3.1%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	1.5%	3.1%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 103



Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs	\$5,824,947	\$5,479,180	\$5,412,365	\$4,739,245	\$3,676,839	\$3,003,888	-12.1%	-18.3%
Total	\$5,824,947	\$5,479,180	\$5,412,365	\$4,739,245	\$3,676,839	\$3,003,888	-12.1%	-18.3%

Table 104




Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs	\$106	\$85	\$87	\$71	\$59	\$48	-14.4%	-18.0%
Total	\$106	\$85	\$87	\$71	\$59	\$48	-14.4%	-18.0%

Table 105

## ADAA Addendum Subcategory Totals Demographic Comparisons


### Age



ADAA Non-Community-Based Age Trends								
Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
12 through 17	87	83	85	89	82	71	-3.8%	-13.4%
18 and over	94	125	119	91	93	125	8.3%	34.4%
Total	181	208	204	180	175	196	2.1%	12.0%

Table 106


### Race



ADAA Non-Community-Based Race Trends								
Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	1	0	0	0	1	NA	NA
Asian	1	2	1	1	2	0	10.0%	-100.0%
Black or African American	65	53	65	45	49	66	3.4%	34.7%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	111	146	133	127	116	121	2.8%	4.3%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	1	1	1	2	NA	100.0%
Other	4	6	4	6	7	6	13.8%	-14.3%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	181	208	204	180	175	196	2.1%	12.0%

Table 108


### Gender



ADAA Non-Community-Based Gender Trends								
Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	144	154	153	129	124	140	-0.1%	12.9%
Female	37	54	51	51	51	56	10.0%	9.8%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	181	208	204	180	175	196	2.1%	12.0%

Table 107

## Mental Health Administration



MHA Placement Trends (One-Day Totals)								
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Educational Facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Centers	534	482	440	371	393	418	-0.04%	6%
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>534</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>-0.04%</b>	<b>6%</b>

Table 109

All MHA non-community placements are funded through Maryland medical assistance, which is a State and federal Medicaid dollar match. “Residential Treatment Centers” is the only placement subcategory utilized by MHA since it is a medical treatment service and, as such, it is the only non-community based placement which is funded by medical assistance.

For clarity in the discussion 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” using federal government nomenclature. RTCs provide behavioral health treatment to children and youth with high levels of clinical need requiring intensive residential medical services and which cannot be met in typical community placements.

The yearly trend of one-day counts for the “Residential Treatment Centers” category shows an average decrease of about 4% over the last five years. The data, however, shows two trends. There were average *decreases* of 11.4% from FY2009 to FY 2012 and average *increases* of 6.1% from FY 2012 to FY 2014. The decreases from FY 2009 to FY 2012 are largely the result of the State’s community-based alternative to residential treatment centers put in place through the federal Medicaid process known as a “Section 1915(c) Home and Community-Based Services Waiver.” This was a demonstration waiver of five years duration.


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. This represents children and youth who were treated in the community through intensive “wraparound” services instead of a physical RTC setting.

All children who required a residential treatment center level of care were 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 had been determined that they could be safely treated in the community with an appropriate plan of care (POC) which included all of the necessary “wraparound” community services.

The 1915(c) Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facility demonstration waiver (“RTC Waiver”) reached its statutory end on September 30, 2012 when it was not reauthorized by the federal government and new enrollments ceased. The number of Maryland children and youth enrolled in the RTC Waiver population of the Care Management Entity gradually declined throughout FY2013 and FY2014 from approximately 130 to zero in early FY2015 (although new enrollments in the RTC Waiver were not permitted, children and youth already enrolled in the RTC Waiver on September 30, 2012 could continue to be served for a maximum of two years, if eligible). DHMH, however, is planning to offer services to a similar population of children and youth through a 1915(i) Medicaid State Plan amendment that will offer targeted case management and community-based services. The State Plan amendment was recently approved by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services with a retroactive start date of October 1, 2014.

Also contributing to a decrease in the numbers of children in residential treatment centers, the average length of stay in the RTC level of care has declined over the past five years. This has been due primarily 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.



MHA Total Served								
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Family Home	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Community-Based	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Community Based	1,127	1,566	924	1,046	863	907	-0.2%	5.1%
Hospitalization	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Not Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,127</b>	<b>1,566</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>1,046</b>	<b>863</b>	<b>907</b>	<b>-0.2%</b>	<b>5.1%</b>

Table 110

The MHA “Total Served” numbers of children and youth in residential treatment centers declined since FY2009 and FY2010. As with the one-day counts above, this is the result of the State’s community-based alternative to residential treatment centers put in place through the federal Medicaid process known as a “Section 1915(c) Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities (PRTF) Waiver.” During these years, larger numbers of Maryland children and youth have been served in community placements with wraparound services.

Note: “MHA Total Served” numbers for FY2012 through FY2014 in Table 110 are based on treatment episodes rather than unduplicated numbers of individuals and, so, likely over-represent the annual numbers of *individuals* served since a few individuals may have had more than one RTC admission and discharge during a fiscal year. Although it is difficult to estimate the precise impact of multiple discharges and readmissions, this may account for a small percentage (<3%) of these numbers.

MHA Placement Population Flow						
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	1,049	1,566	648	918	
2011	435	489	924	430	494	
2012	441	605	1,046	650	396	
2013	407	456	863	496	367	
2014	401	480	881	477	404	
Three-Year Change	-7.8%	-1.8%	-4.7%	10.9%	-18.2%	
Average Yearly Change	-4.7%	-5.9%	-8.6%	-2.0%	-12.7%	
Recent Year Change	-1.5%	5.3%	2.1%	-3.8%	10.1%	

Table 111

Table 111 represents the flow of admissions and discharges from the in-State and out-of-State residential treatment centers over the course of the fiscal year. It is based on claims for reimbursement for the residential treatment center level of care. When claims are received can slightly affect the numbers of placements at the ending and start of the fiscal year so they are not exactly equal.

The FY2010 figures in Table 111 are calculated differently from other years; however, it is included here for the sake of consistency with past reports. In FY2011, the method for calculating population flow was changed and has been applied in years FY2011-2014. FY2010 will not be included in future reports.


Total Served data for FY2011 through FY2014 show a 13.2% increase from FY2011 to FY2012, a 17.5% decrease from FY2013 to FY2013, and a 3.7% increase from FY2013 to FY2014. The average change from FY2011 to FY2014 is only -0.2%. A least-squares (Pearson correlation) line fitted to the FY2011 to FY2014 data, however, indicates a trend of moderate reduction in total served over the four years. This is due in part from Maryland’s community-based “RTC waiver” alternative to residential treatment centers in place from FY2009 through 2014, but the data also suggests a trend of reduction in overall RTC placements.

MHA 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	Out-of-State	Unknown		
Allegany	23	3.7%	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Anne Arundel	58	9.4%	0	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Baltimore	70	11.4%	0	0	16	48	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Baltimore City	31	5.0%	0	0	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Calvert	1	0.2%	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	5	0.8%	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	14	2.3%	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	3	0.5%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	7	1.1%	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	15	2.4%	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	24	3.9%	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	10	1.6%	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	15	2.4%	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Howard	3	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	1	0	
Kent	19	3.1%	0	0	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	40	6.5%	0	0	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	25	4.1%	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	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	3	0.5%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	2	0.3%	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	1	0	
Talbot	12	2.0%	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	9	1.5%	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	13	2.1%	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	
Out-of-State	11	1.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	
Unknown	202	32.8%	0	0	0	202	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	615	100.0	0	0	80	399	0	0	0	0	0	44	45	0	0	0	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	
% of children from jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	22.9%	68.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	6.7%	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%
% children Statewide in all			0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	64.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%	7.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	

Table 112

Although placement within (or near) a youth’s jurisdiction is one factor considered in placing a child in a residential treatment center, the primary determinant is the youth’s treatment needs, since some types of treatment services are available in some residential treatment centers 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 10 RTCs located in five jurisdictions so these are not uniformly distributed throughout the State. Youth from jurisdictions other than these five will necessarily be placed outside his/her jurisdiction. The in-State RTCs are located in Baltimore County (4), Baltimore City (2), Montgomery County (2), Dorchester County (1), and Frederick County (1). Finally, each RTC determines which youth will be admitted, considering programming and vacancy constraints upon admissions.



MHA Non-Community Based Cost Trends								
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Residential Treatment Centers	\$94,033,805	\$91,629,633	\$72,649,911	\$71,180,664	\$66,348,547	\$67,700,710	-6.0%	2.0%
Total	\$94,033,805	\$91,629,633	\$72,649,911	\$71,180,664	\$66,348,547	\$67,700,710	-6.0%	2.0%

Table 114

As noted earlier, all MHA non-community based placements are in residential treatment centers. The figures in this Table represent the total medical assistance costs for all residential treatment center placements. These costs vary by the number of youth who are placed, by the specific placements since the programs receive different reimbursement, and these program costs themselves also vary year to year. As the number of youth in RTCs and the length of stay in the RTCs have decreased over the past five fiscal years, however, the cost for the treatment of youth in the RTCs has also decreased over the same period of time.



MHA Non-Community Based Cost Per Bed-Day Trends								
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Residential Treatment Centers	\$377	\$432	\$453	\$460	\$458	\$475	4.8%	3.8%
Total	\$377	\$432	\$453	\$460	\$458	\$475	4.8%	3.8%

Table 115

These figures represent the medical assistance costs for all youth placed by MHA in residential treatment centers divided by the number of bed days (the total number of days in residential treatment for all youth placed in residential treatment centers). These bed-day costs can vary due to utilization of residential treatment centers whose costs which 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 four years.


### **MHA Recommendations**

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 vacancy rates for the in-State RTCs and plans to serve youth in the community via the 1915(i) State Plan amendment. It would seem desirable to have the Maryland RTCs offer more options for specialized treatment, such as treatment for fire-setting and sexually offensive behavior, especially for youth with low levels of intellectual functioning. At this time, however, it appears unlikely that there would be sufficient numbers of in-State referrals to make financial sense for an in-State RTC to develop such programming.

MHA efforts to minimize the number of Maryland 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 Maryland youth with needs for specialized treatment or who are in especially complicated circumstances, an out-of-State placement will continue to be necessary.

## MHA Addendum Subcategory Totals Demographic Comparisons

### Age




**MHA Age Trends**

Age	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	1	1	0	NA	-100.0%
6 through 11	53	32	50	49	88	51	10.4%	-42.0%
12 through 17	443	406	351	285	301	340	-4.4%	13.0%
18 and over	38	44	39	36	3	27	141.0%	800.0%
Total	534	482	440	371	393	418	-4.4%	6.4%

**Table 116**

### Gender




**MHA Gender Trends**

Gender	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	331	276	272	232	243	269	-3.5%	10.7%
Female	203	205	168	139	150	157	-4.3%	4.7%
Unknown	0	1	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Total	534	482	440	371	393	426	-4.0%	8.4%

**Table 117**

### Race




**MHA Race Trends**

Race	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	0	3	3	1	1	NA	0.0%
Asian	2	2	2	3	1	4	56.7%	300.0%
Black or African American	287	263	225	177	208	221	-4.1%	6.3%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	221	193	175	149	137	157	-6.1%	14.6%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	0	0	26	NA	NA
Other	23	24	19	24	24	8	-11.4%	-66.7%
Unknown	1	0	16	15	22	1	NA	-95.5%
Total	534	482	440	371	393	418	-4.4%	6.4%

**Table 118**

**MHA Addendum**  
**Subcategory Out-of-State One-Day Census Totals**




MHA OOS Placement Trends								
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Residential Treatment Centers	23	8	8	6	8	20	18.6%	150.0%
Total	23	8	8	6	8	20	18.6%	150.0%

**Table 119**

## Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) Summary


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

An out-of-home placement only occurs for a student, placed by a LSS, when the team determines that the child requires a residential educational facility. Maryland residential treatment centers are approved for educational purposes as residential educational facilities. The number of students requiring residential settings as a school placement is approximately .0005% of the total population of students with disabilities. The LSSs are experiencing a continued decline in the number of children requiring residential services through the IEP team process. There has been an increase of services at the community level under targeted initiatives such as the Autism Waiver and specific mental health partnerships. As students with severe autism and severe emotional disabilities enter their teen-age and young-adult years, providing educational services for these students may become increasingly challenging because of their age and the exhaustion of community-based services. Older students with residential needs frequently remain in residential schools until they transition to adult services. The LSSs are required to provide special education and related services through the school year in which the child turns 21.



MSDE Placement Trends								
Subcategory	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Secure/Non-RTC	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Residential Educational Facilities	51	58	44	58	53	47	0.3%	-11.3%
Residential Treatment Centers	47	37	22	0	0	0	NA	NA
Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>-13.1%</b>	<b>-11.3%</b>

Table 120



MSDE Total Served								
Category	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Family Home	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Community-Based	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Non-Community Based	112	96	69	70	58	47	-15.4%	-19.0%
Hospitalization	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Not Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>-15.4%</b>	<b>-19.0%</b>


Table 121

MSDE Population Flow (All Placements)					
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Total Served	Ends in FT (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
2013	33	25	58	5	53
2014	38	15	53	6	47
Three-Year Change	-22.4%	-25.0%	-23.2%	-45.5%	-19.0%
Average Yearly Change	-9.3%	-3.8%	-10.5%	-20.1%	-7.3%
Recent Year Change	15.2%	-40.0%	-8.6%	20.0%	-11.3%

Table 122

MSDE 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	Out-of-State	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	4	8.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Baltimore City	4	8.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	
Calvert	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	1	0	
Caroline	2	4.3%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	2	4.3%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	1	2.1%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	6	12.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	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	3	6.4%	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Howard	1	2.1%	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	
Kent	2	4.3%	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	
Montgomery	18	38.3%	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	
Prince George's	3	6.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	
Out-of-State	0	0.0%	0	0	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	47	100.0%	0	0	1	0	0	12	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	
% of children from 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%	0.0%
% children Statewide in all			0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	25.5%	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	19.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	36.2%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 123



MSDE Total Costs								
Subcategory	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Residential Educational Facilities	\$15,161,831	\$13,918,875	\$12,672,875	\$11,690,683	\$11,607,471	\$10,972,899	-6.2%	-5.5%
Total	\$15,161,831	\$13,918,875	\$12,672,875	\$11,690,683	\$11,607,471	\$10,972,899	-6.2%	-5.5%

Table 124

### MSDE Recommendations

MSDE Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) has worked directly with Maryland private day and residential education facilities to build in-State capacity for students requiring intensive services. For the school year 2013-2104, an established Maryland provider became active in serving students with autism for residential placements under the Autism Waiver. MSDE provided ongoing support and technical assistance to this provider and others to build capacity and quality programming for students. During the 2014-2015 school year MSDE, DSE/EIS will continue to support local schools systems to enhance services and supports for students to remain in their community schools.


In addition, MSDE, DSE/EIS increased the number of children directly served under the Autism Waiver. This increase in funding capacity increased the number of children with autism whose needs are supported in their homes and communities.

MSDE, DSE/EIS recommends the continuation of direct work with Maryland providers to meet the increasing needs of this population.

MSDE supports cross-agency collaboration to ensure the development of community-based and residential programs to meet the needs of students typically placed out-of-State and to facilitate the return of these students to Maryland programs and schools.

## MSDE Addendum Subcategory Totals Demographic Comparisons

### Age




MSDE Non-Community-Based Age Trends

	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
0 through 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6 through 11	2	1	1	1	1	1	-10.0%	0.0%
12 through 17	19	9	7	6	7	6	-17.4%	-14.3%
18 and over	26	27	14	13	7	10	-10.9%	42.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>-16.5%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>

**Table 125**

### Gender




MSDE Non-Community-Based Gender Trends

	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
Male	37	31	15	12	8	11	-16.7%	37.5%
Female	10	6	7	8	7	6	-7.2%	-14.3%
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>-16.5%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>

**Table 126**

### Race



MSDE Non-Community-Based Race Trends

	1/31/2009	1/31/2010	1/31/2011	1/31/2012	1/31/2013	1/31/2014	Average Change	Last Year Change
American Indian / Alaskan	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Black or African American	12	10	8	7	6	6	-12.7%	0.0%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
White	34	25	14	13	9	11	-17.2%	22.2%
Bi-Racial / Multiple Race	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Other	1	2	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>-16.5%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>

**Table 127**

## MSDE Addendum

### Subcategory Out-of-State One-Day Census Totals and Demographic Comparisons

#### Out-of-State Placement Trends




Table 128

#### Out-of-State Age




Table 129

#### Out-of-State Gender




Table 130

#### Out-of-State Race




Table 131

## Maryland School for the Blind and Maryland School for the Deaf

### The Maryland School for the Deaf (MSD)

MSD is established under §8-304 of the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland. MSDE 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 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 moderate to severe disabilities under §8-310.1 with funding provided jointly by the State and the local jurisdiction. The majority of students 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 students, placed by the IEP team process, live on campus during the school week.

Maryland School for the Deaf Total Costs				
	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
FY2013	125	\$2,415,309	\$5,704,625	\$8,119,934
FY2014	125	\$2,456,214	\$5,877,375	\$8,333,589

Table 132

### The Maryland School for the Blind (MSB)

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 required to establish and operate a program of enhanced services<sup>12</sup> for students who are blind and have other disabilities. Funding for these services is provided jointly by the State and local jurisdiction. 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 during the school week.

Maryland School for the Blind Total Costs				
	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
FY2013	91	\$5,043,578	\$9,632,009	\$14,675,587
FY2014	93	\$5,238,222	\$9,521,222	\$14,760,114

Table 132

<sup>12</sup> Enhanced services allow students to receive educational services in Maryland rather than out-of-State residential programs.

## **Family Preservation Services**

---

DHR provides family preservation services to children and family at risk of child maltreatment and/or out of home placement. 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. These services are provided by the Local Departments of Social Services (LDSSs) as In-Home or Family Preservation services.

From 1990 to the present, Interagency Family Preservation Services (IFPS) was added in Maryland as an inter-agency approach to preserving families with children at imminent risk of placement from all child-serving Agencies. Until FY2008 IFPS was administered by the Governor’s Office for Children (GOC), after which it was integrated into DHR’s In-Home services.

Family preservation/In-Home services can be evaluated by examining families’ risk levels, and the incidence rates of maltreatment and out of home (OOH) placement. Risk is assessed by the Maryland Family Risk Assessment (MFRA), which is administered by the caseworker at the initiation of services, several times throughout services, and at case closure. Risk data for families served in In-Home services is discussed in this Report.

Maltreatment (child abuse or neglect) is measured by the number of indicated investigation findings of child maltreatment. OOH placement is measured by the number of children entering OOH care. Both measures are analyzed here for incidents of maltreatment or OOH placement among children while they were receiving In-Home services, and for children who had recently received In-Home services.

DHR In-Home services are separated into two (2) categories:

1. Interagency Family Preservation Services (IFPS); and
2. Consolidated In-Home Services – including Services to Families with Children (a short-term service featuring an assessment of family needs) and all other In-Home services.

Data for the two separate categories (IFPS and Consolidated) will be presented, along with data for the two programs combined (Total In-Home Services).

### **Service Counts for DHR In-Home Services**

The table below contains four years of data for Total In-Home services, Consolidated In-Home services, and IFPS. A review of the last four years’ information on overall served cases indicates there was a 13% increase in the overall number of families and a corresponding 9% increase in the number of children served in In-Home programs from FY 2011 to FY 2014.

Families and Children Served and Newly Served*						
Total In-Home						
	All Cases Served during FY			New Cases during FY		
	Cases	Children	Child/Case	Cases	Children	Child/Case
FY 2011	7,517	16,425	2.2	5,260	11,396	2.2
FY 2012	8,755	18,799	2.2	6,583	13,935	2.1
FY 2013	8,751	18,836	2.2	6,278	13,391	2.1
FY 2014	8,494	17,836	2.1	6,552	13,463	2.1
Consolidated In-Home Services						
	All Cases Served during FY			New Cases during FY		
	Cases	Children	Child/Case	Cases	Children	Child/Case
FY 2011	6,555	14,173	2.2	4,488	9,593	2.1
FY 2012	7,850	16,633	2.1	5,870	12,237	2.1
FY 2013	7,777	16,508	2.1	5,467	11,481	2.1
FY 2014	7,527	15,643	2.1	5,807	11,797	2.0
Interagency Family Preservation Services						
	All Cases Served during FY			New Cases during FY		
	Cases	Children	Child/Case	Cases	Children	Child/Case
FY 2011	962	2,252	2.3	772	1,803	2.3
FY 2012	905	2,166	2.4	713	1,698	2.4
FY 2013	974	2,328	2.4	811	1,910	2.4
FY 2014	967	2,193	2.3	745	1,666	2.2

Table 133

Total In-Home served and newly-served families increased significantly from FY2011 to FY2012 (12% and 24%, respectively). This was the first substantial increase among In-Home services in several years, and allayed concerns about the downward trends in In-Home services in prior years during a time period in which DHR out-of-home (OOH) placements had been decreasing significantly as well. Among some stakeholders, there had been the belief that if DHR OOH care placements were decreasing, then In-Home services should increase; this argument, however, ignored the increasing impact of DHR’s Family-Centered Practice model, which emphasized child and family involvement in case planning and decisions, and utilizes natural and community resources to meet families’ needs, which often negates the need for DHR/LDSS intervention.

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

This analysis focuses mainly on the question “Are children better off?” by measuring the absence of the occurrence of indicated findings of maltreatment, and the absence of placement in DHR out of home care.

The goal of In-Home services is to support families in caring for their children, and to remove risk of maltreatment, not the children, from their homes. Families generally want to stay together even when challenges exist, and In-Home staff strives to assist families in reaching that goal. Despite these efforts (by both families and DHR), there are instances of child maltreatment or the need for a child to be removed from the home while in (or after) In-Home services.

An indicated finding of child maltreatment refers to a decision made by a LDSS Child Protective Services (CPS) investigator, upon completion of an investigation, that there is sufficient

evidence, which has not been refuted, of child maltreatment. (There are two other CPS findings, not discussed 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.)

OOH placements begin with a removal from the home of a child, which occurs when their safety cannot be assured in their home. The date of removal marks the beginning of the OOH placement episode.<sup>13</sup> In this analysis, only DHR OOH placements are discussed—while other Maryland agencies place or fund the placement of children, this section discusses only DHR OOH placement among children who have participated in DHR’s In-Home services, as these placements are generally due only to child maltreatment. (A small number of placements exist due to children’s severe medical/mental health/developmental needs, through Voluntary Placement Agreements.)

Two measures are used to analyze the effectiveness of In-Home services in preventing child maltreatment and OOH placements:

- Did a CPS investigation result in an indicated finding for children receiving In-Home services?
- Did a DHR OOH placement occur for children receiving In-Home services?

For each of these indicators, data is analyzed for the time period during which a child received services, and then for the one-year time period after the child received services.

Measure	Timeframes	
Did a CPS investigation result in an <u>indicated finding</u> for children receiving services?	<u><i>During Services</i></u> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the In-Home service close date; or</li> <li>• 12 months following the start date of In-Home services.</li> </ul>	<u><i>Within 1 Year of Case Close</i></u> 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.
Did a DHR <u>OOH placement</u> occur for children receiving service?		In other words, these are the same children as the “During Services” children whose cases closed during the 12-month observation period.  The observation time period for each child is the 12-month period beginning on the close date of In-Home services and ending 12 months later.

Table 134

<sup>13</sup> Not all children found to be the victim of an indicated maltreatment finding are removed, nor have all removed children been the victim in an indicated maltreatment finding. Removal is based on safety issues alone; if an alleged maltreater is no longer in the home and/or an appropriate safety plan is in place, removal may not be necessary. Additionally, safety is assessed continuously, and removal decisions are made based on the current situation while findings to investigations generally take up to two months to finalize. Safety issues may require removal regardless of an investigation finding.

Table 135 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 DHR OOH 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. Therefore, data for events occurring within 1 year of case closure are available for children newly served in FY2012, and data for events occurring during services is available for children who entered In-Home services in FY2013.

Using this construct, this table shows the number children who began In-Home services in FYs 2009-2014, and those that started In-Home services in those years but also completed services within 12 months of their service start date. Although this table includes data on cases (*i.e.*, families), subsequent data on indicated maltreatment and OOH placement will focus on children, not cases.

Total In-Home Cases*						
Fiscal Year	Cases			Children		
	Newly Served Cases	Newly-Served & Closed Within 1 Year	% Closed Within 1 Year	Newly-Served Children	Newly-Served & Closed Within 1 Year	% Closed Within 1 Year
FY2009	6,274	5,528	88%	13,462	11,689	87%
FY2010	5,515	4,784	87%	11,863	10,229	86%
FY2011	5,260	4,568	87%	11,396	9,800	86%
FY2012	6,583	5,827	89%	13,935	12,257	88%
FY2013	6,278	5,551	88%	13,391	11,783	88%
FY 2014	6,552	NA until FY15		13,463	NA until FY15	

\*FY2009 – 2013 data revised

Table 135

Over the past six fiscal years, the percentage of cases (families) and children that complete services within one year of beginning In-Home services is between 86% and 89%.

Indicated CPS Findings and Foster Care Placement Rates* (Total In-Home Cases)								
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
FY2009	2.9%	396	3.3%	383	4.0%	536	2.4%	278
FY2010	3.9%	464	3.9%	401	4.6%	542	2.3%	233
FY2011	4.2%	475	3.3%	326	5.2%	598	2.5%	244
FY2012	2.6%	367	3.2%	397	4.5%	622	2.2%	264
FY2013	2.6%	345	NA until FY15		4.2%	557	NA until FY15	

\*FY2009 – 2012 data revised

Table 136

Indicated CPS Findings and OOH Care Placement Rates*								
Consolidated 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
FY2011	4.6%	440	3.4%	277	5.7%	548	2.5%	202
FY2012	2.7%	332	3.3%	354	4.6%	564	2.0%	219
FY2013	2.7%	314	NA until FY 15		4.3%	490	NA until FY 15	
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
FY2011	1.9%	35	3.0%	49	2.8%	50	2.6%	42
FY2012	2.1%	35	2.7%	43	3.4%	58	2.9%	45
FY2013	1.6%	31	NA until FY 15		3.5%	67	NA until FY 15	

\*FY2011 – 2012 data revised

Table 137

### Indicated CPS Investigations/Child Maltreatment

During the past five fiscal years, the percentage of children who have experienced an indicated Child Protective Service investigation that resulted in an indicated finding of child maltreatment during In-Home services ranged between 2.6% in FY2012 and 2013, and 4.2% in FY2011. Despite these fluctuations, since FY2009, the average percentage of children not experiencing indicated maltreatment is 96.8%; for FY2013 the percentage was 97.4%.

Within one year of case closure, an average of 3.4% of children experienced an indicated finding of maltreatment within one year of case closure; therefore, since FY2009, an average of 96.6% of children did not experience an indicated maltreatment finding up to one year after finishing In-Home services.

During services and for the one-year period after services, therefore, approximately 97% of children did not experience an indicated finding of maltreatment over the past four to five years. For the past three fiscal years, there has been a lower rate of indicated maltreatment findings among children in IFPS compared to those in Consolidated In-Home services both during and within the year following case closure.

### OOH Placement

Although there was a slight increase in FY2011 (to 5.2%), the general rate of OOH placement during In-Home services has ranged from 4.0% to 4.6%, dropping to 4.2% in FY 2013. Overall, an average of 95.5% of children served in In-Home services from FY 2009 to FY 2013 was able to remain with their families during In-Home services, and avoid OOH placement.

OOH placement in the year following In-Home services has been stable between 2.2% and 2.5% for the past four years, with the lowest rate (2.2%) this past fiscal year. For these past four years, an average of 97.7% of children remain in their home and avoided OOH placement within the first year after receiving In-Home services.

For OOH placement, a lower percentage of children in IFPS entered OOH care during services than Consolidated services – in FY2013, 3.5% of children in IFPS services entered OOH care, compared to 4.3% in Consolidated services. After care, however, there is a slightly higher rate among children who had received IFPS than Consolidated (2.9% versus 2.0%, respectively, FY 2012 rates).

### **Analysis of Maryland Family Risk Assessment (MFRA) for In-Home Services**

DHR is in the process of revising and implementing two new risk and service assessment instruments. The Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths- Family version (CANS-F) was developed, which provides specific caregiver information and is intended to support strengths-based case plans for in-home services. Additionally, a revised Maryland Family Risk Assessment (MFRA) has been designed based on an actuarial model, which will provide increased inter-rater reliability. It is anticipated that these instruments will be implemented in June 2015. Once these instruments are 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.

Data presented here is based on the current MFRA, which offers the advantage of consistency in analyzing data from prior years, and consistency within cases. Workers are trained on the MFRA during pre-service orientation and through ongoing supervision.

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.

### **MFRA Intake Ratings**

Within two weeks of starting an In-Home service case, workers are required to complete a MFRA rating for the family. Data, however, is not available for an average of 18% of In-Home cases for FY2011 - 2014. Two reasons seem most likely for this missing data: first, the MFRA may be completed during the investigation and then shared with the In-Home services team but not made a formal part of the In-Home service record; second, workers may be completing the MFRA in a paper-version but not recording the results in MD CHESSIE. DHR is working on

correcting these issues through a quality assurance system, as well as through improved supervision of case workers.

Safety, not risk, is the decisive factor in determining if children must be removed from their family of origin and placed into OOH care. (Safety is measured in a separate instrument, the SAFE-C.) Although safety and risk are different constructs (safety is concerned with the child's immediate condition), many cases with high risk also have enough immediate safety issues to warrant an out of home removal. Therefore, families with the highest risk may be more often served in OOH services than In-Home services.

Initial Risk based on MFRA Ratings*								
Total In-Home Services								
Fiscal Year	n	Percent						
		None	Low	Moderate	High	Missing		
FY 2011	7,517	9%	28%	39%	10%	14%		
FY 2012	8,755	15%	29%	33%	8%	16%		
FY 2013	8,751	17%	26%	31%	7%	18%		
FY 2014	8,494	14%	27%	28%	6%	24%		
Consolidated In-Home Services								
Fiscal Year	n	Percent						
		None	Low	Moderate	High	Missing		
FY 2011	6,555	9%	29%	38%	9%	14%		
FY 2012	7,850	16%	29%	31%	7%	16%		
FY 2013	7,776	19%	27%	29%	7%	19%		
FY 2014	7,527	15%	28%	26%	6%	25%		
Interagency Family Preservation Services								
Fiscal Year	n	Percent						
		None	Low	Moderate	High	Missing		
FY 2011	962	4%	21%	48%	17%	103%		
FY 2012	905	5%	22%	50%	12%	11%		
FY 2013	972	6%	24%	49%	12%	9%		
FY 2014	967	6%	23%	44%	13%	14%		

\*FY 2011 – 2013 data revised

Table 138

This table shows initial MFRA ratings. In both Consolidated In-Home Services and IFPS cases over the past four years, the largest proportion of families has moderate risk levels. Families with low risk are the next largest group. Among Consolidated In-Home cases, those with no risk represented a higher proportion of cases than those with high risk in FYs 2012 and 2013, while the reverse is true for IFPS. Overall, over a third of all families in FY2014 (34%) had moderate or high risk at the initial MFRA evaluation.

### **Family Preservation Summary**

DHR In-Home services are a critical component of meeting the needs of thousands of vulnerable children and their families. In FY2014 approximately 17,800 children from 8,500 families received DHR In-Home services.

Among those who had an initial MFRA (risk assessment) in FY2014:

- 34% had moderate to high risk at the initial assessment

Among those served in In-Home services, based on FY2013 entries (most recent year for which data is available):

- 97% of children did not experience an indicated finding for maltreatment during services, and
- 96% remained with their families and were not removed into a DHR OOH placement during services.

Among those children whose In-Home services ended, based on FY2012 entries (the most recent year for which data is available):

- 97% of children did not experience an indicated finding for maltreatment within one year of case closure, and
- 96% remain with their families and were not removed into a DHR OOH placement within one year of case closure.

As of August 31, 2014, there were 5,225 children in DHR OOH care (DHR/SSA State Stat Place Matters file, August 2014 data); this is the lowest number of children requiring removal from their homes in over 25 years. The provision of DHR In-Home services and other community supports are crucial in keeping children in their homes and families.

DHR's Place Matters Initiative has been able to achieve this success for children and families through its Family-Centered Practice model and use of Family Involvement Meetings. Child, youth, and family involvement are essential in DHR's OOH and In-Home practice models, which also rely on community supports and services. Providing In-Home services and other supports to families is necessary to continue to keep children with their families and to strengthen families' abilities to care for their children.

## **APPENDIX: Placement by Jurisdiction**

Family Home, Adoptive

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	Out-of-State	Unknown
Allegany	4	12.5%	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
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	2	6.3%	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	0
Baltimore City	5	15.6%	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	3	9.4%	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
Caroline	4	12.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	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	4	12.5%	0	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
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	3.1%	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
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	2	6.3%	0	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
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	2	6.3%	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
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	2	6.3%	0	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
Wicomico	3	9.4%	0	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
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
Out-of-State	0	0.0%	0	0	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	32	100.0	4	0	4	2	3	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	0	2
% of children from jurisdiction			100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	40.0%	100.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children Statewide in all			12.5%	0.0%	12.5%	6.3%	9.4%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.4%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	6.3%	12.5%	0.0%	6.3%

Family Home, Foster Care

		Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																											
Home Jurisdiction of Children	# children from jurisdiction in placement	% of children Statewide in placements from jurisdiction	Alegany	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	Out-of-State	Unknown	
Alegany	29	2.6%	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Anne Arundel	52	4.6%	0	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1
Baltimore	111	9.8%	0	0	95	6	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	
Baltimore City	335	29.6%	0	2	70	242	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	5	
Calvert	26	2.3%	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	8	0.7%	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	25	2.2%	0	0	1	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	86	7.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	45	4.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	5	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	
Frederick	44	3.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	12	1.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	67	5.9%	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howard	9	0.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	3	0.3%	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	
Montgomery	99	8.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	72	6.4%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	
Queen Anne's	2	0.2%	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	
Somerset	7	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	23	2.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	6	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	50	4.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	0	0	4	0	
Wicomico	10	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	
Worcester	6	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	
Out-of-State	0	0.0%	0	0	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	1132	100.0	25	48	171	249	24	8	26	90	48	4	47	15	66	16	3	95	62	3	2	23	7	48	21	1	23	7	
% of children from jurisdiction			86.2%	86.5%	85.6%	72.2%	92.3%	62.5%	92.0%	100.0%	100.0%	40.0%	95.5%	100.0%	92.5%	100.0%	100.0%	96.0%	86.1%	100.0%	28.6%	100.0%	100.0%	90.0%	100.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	
% children Statewide in all			2.2%	4.2%	15.1%	22.0%	2.1%	0.7%	2.3%	8.0%	4.2%	0.4%	4.2%	1.3%	5.8%	1.4%	0.3%	8.4%	5.5%	0.3%	0.2%	2.0%	0.6%	4.2%	1.9%	0.1%	2.0%	0.6%	

Family Home, Relative Care

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	Out-of-State	Unknown	
Allegany	19	2.5%	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1
Anne Arundel	12	1.6%	0	8	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Baltimore	26	3.4%	0	2	16	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Baltimore City	475	62.4%	0	16	127	283	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	17	7	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3
Calvert	15	2.0%	0	4	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Caroline	6	0.8%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	
Carroll	3	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	10	1.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Charles	16	2.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Dorchester	3	0.4%	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	2	0
Frederick	17	2.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Garrett	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	
Harford	36	4.7%	0	2	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	13	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Howard	6	0.8%	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	53	7.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	1	0	41	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	
Prince George's	34	4.5%	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	
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	0.1%	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	
St. Mary's	16	2.1%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	3	0	
Talbot	2	0.3%	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	
Washington	8	1.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	1	
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	1	0	0	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	0	0	0	1	
Out-of-State	0	0.0%	0	0	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	761	100.0	15	37	160	287	8	0	6	8	17	1	21	0	34	10	0	46	36	1	1	12	5	6	3	0	21	26	
% of children from jurisdiction			78.9%	66.7%	61.5%	59.6%	40.0%	0.0%	100.0%	70.0%	68.8%	33.3%	76.5%	0.0%	36.1%	16.7%	0.0%	77.4%	61.8%	0.0%	0.0%	62.5%	100.0%	75.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children Statewide in all			2.0%	4.9%	21.0%	37.7%	1.1%	0.0%	0.8%	1.1%	2.2%	0.1%	2.8%	0.0%	4.5%	1.3%	0.0%	6.0%	4.7%	0.1%	0.1%	1.6%	0.7%	0.8%	0.4%	0.0%	2.8%	3.4%	

Family Home, Restricted Relative Care

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	Out-of-State	Unknown	
Allegany	3	0.9%	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	
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	24	7.4%	0	1	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	233	71.5%	0	5	56	148	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	
Calvert	6	1.8%	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	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	2	0.6%	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	0	0.0%	0	0	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	2	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	6	1.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	2	0.6%	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	0	
Howard	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	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	14	4.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Prince George's	12	3.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Queen Anne's	2	0.6%	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	
Somerset	3	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	6	1.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	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	10	3.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	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	
Out-of-State	0	0.0%	0	0	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	326	100.0%	3	7	71	151	4	0	3	0	2	1	1	6	12	5	0	13	13	2	3	8	0	8	0	0	11	2	
% of children from jurisdiction			100.0%	0.0%	58.3%	63.5%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	85.7%	91.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	80.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% children Statewide in all			0.9%	2.1%	21.8%	46.3%	1.2%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	1.8%	3.7%	1.5%	0.0%	4.0%	4.0%	0.6%	0.9%	2.5%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.6%	

Family Home, Treatment Foster 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	Out-of-State	Unknown	
Allegany	6	0.4%	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Anne Arundel	50	3.1%	0	14	10	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	6	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	
Baltimore	194	11.9%	0	4	107	53	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	10	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	3	
Baltimore City	806	49.5%	0	19	348	350	0	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	16	10	0	11	33	0	1	0	0	3	4	0	0	2	
Calvert	17	1.0%	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	
Caroline	8	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	
Carroll	4	0.2%	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	25	1.5%	0	1	5	2	0	0	0	6	0	2	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	
Charles	12	0.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	9	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	
Frederick	17	1.0%	0	0	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	2	0.1%	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	
Harford	45	2.8%	0	0	14	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howard	18	1.1%	0	1	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	1	0.1%	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	85	5.2%	0	2	14	4	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	1	34	15	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	
Prince George's	219	13.5%	1	3	13	7	6	0	3	0	7	1	0	0	0	8	0	3	16	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	
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	14	0.9%	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	24	1.5%	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	
Talbot	11	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	
Washington	24	1.5%	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	20	1.2%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	
Worcester	13	0.8%	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	
Out-of-State	3	0.2%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	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	1627	100.0	12	45	532	438	9	7	8	10	29	17	3	3	59	32	2	53	23	5	4	10	1	5	44	49	0	2	8
% of children from jurisdiction			66.7%	28.0%	55.2%	43.4%	5.9%	12.5%	0.0%	24.0%	41.7%	66.7%	5.9%	50.0%	48.9%	22.2%	100.0%	40.0%	74.0%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	27.3%	66.7%	85.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% children Statewide in all			0.7%	2.8%	32.7%	26.9%	0.6%	0.4%	1.1%	0.6%	1.8%	1.0%	0.2%	0.2%	3.6%	2.0%	0.1%	3.3%	14.4%	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	0.3%	2.7%	3.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	

Family Home, Living Arrangement

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	Out-of-State	Unknown
Allegany	14	5.9%	13	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
Anne Arundel	21	8.9%	0	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Baltimore	34	14.4%	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Baltimore City	71	30.1%	0	0	57	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	3
Calvert	2	0.8%	0	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
Caroline	1	0.4%	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
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	4	1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Charles	3	1.3%	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	2
Dorchester	1	0.4%	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	7	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	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	23	9.7%	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Howard	1	0.4%	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
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	26	11.0%	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Prince George's	18	7.6%	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3
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	0.4%	0	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
St. Mary's	4	1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	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	5	2.1%	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
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
Out-of-State	0	0.0%	0	0	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	236	100.0%	13	15	91	4	1	0	1	5	3	2	7	2	18	1	0	16	11	0	2	3	0	6	1	0	14	20
% of children from jurisdiction			92.9%	66.7%	73.5%	5.6%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	75.0%	33.3%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	69.6%	100.0%	0.0%	61.5%	38.9%	0.0%	100.0%	75.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children Statewide in all			5.5%	6.4%	38.6%	1.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	2.1%	1.3%	0.8%	3.0%	0.8%	7.6%	0.4%	0.0%	6.8%	4.7%	0.0%	0.8%	1.3%	0.0%	2.5%	0.4%	0.0%	5.9%	8.5%

Community, Independent Living

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	Out-of-State	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	5	2.5%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	20	10.0%	0	0	14	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	126	62.7%	0	0	65	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Calvert	1	0.5%	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
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	1	0.5%	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	2	1.0%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	1.5%	0	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
Garrett	1	0.5%	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
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	5	2.5%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	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	13	6.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	22	10.9%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1
Queen Anne's	1	0.5%	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
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	1	0.5%	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
Out-of-State	0	0.0%	0	0	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	201	100.0%	0	0	86	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	21	22	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	1
% of children from jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	70.0%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	0.0%	84.6%	72.7%	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%	42.8%	29.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	2.5%	0.0%	10.4%	10.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%

Community, RCCP

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	Out-of-State	Unknown
Allegany	14	1.7%	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0
Anne Arundel	49	5.9%	0	3	17	8	0	2	0	0	3	0	1	0	3	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	0
Baltimore	94	11.2%	1	0	36	23	0	2	0	3	0	0	1	1	3	1	0	6	7	0	0	0	4	0	0	5	1	
Baltimore City	201	24.0%	0	7	51	93	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	20	0	0	0	10	0	0	4	0	
Calvert	20	2.4%	1	0	5	1	1	2	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0
Caroline	3	0.4%	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Carroll	9	1.1%	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Cecil	25	3.0%	0	0	12	2	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Charles	17	2.0%	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	
Dorchester	5	0.6%	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Frederick	30	3.6%	2	0	8	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	6	0	0	2	0	
Garrett	6	0.7%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	
Harford	46	5.5%	0	0	12	1	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	5	0	
Howard	23	2.7%	0	0	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	
Kent	6	0.7%	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	73	8.7%	0	3	6	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	34	9	0	0	0	8	0	0	5	1	
Prince George's	117	14.0%	4	5	26	11	1	1	0	4	2	0	2	0	1	1	3	9	28	0	0	0	13	0	0	6	0	
Queen Anne's	6	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Somerset	3	0.4%	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
St. Mary's	17	2.0%	0	1	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	
Talbot	3	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Washington	36	4.3%	1	0	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	2	
Wicomico	19	2.3%	0	0	5	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Worcester	4	0.5%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Out-of-State	11	1.3%	0	0	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	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	837	100.0	20	19	229	152	5	29	0	19	16	0	10	8	20	5	8	82	80	0	0	1	0	84	1	0	45	4
% of children from jurisdiction			42.9%	6.1%	38.3%	46.3%	5.0%	33.3%	0.0%	16.0%	41.2%	0.0%	6.7%	16.7%	23.9%	0.0%	0.0%	46.6%	23.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	47.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children Statewide in all			2.4%	2.3%	27.4%	18.2%	0.6%	3.5%	0.0%	2.3%	1.9%	0.0%	1.2%	1.0%	2.4%	0.6%	1.0%	9.8%	9.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	10.0%	0.1%	0.0%	5.4%	0.5%

Community, CSLA

		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	Out-of-State	Unknown
Allegany	3	4.4%	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	0
Anne Arundel	2	2.9%	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
Baltimore	8	11.8%	0	0	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	3	4.4%	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	2	2.9%	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
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	6	8.8%	0	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
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	2	2.9%	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	0	0.0%	0	0	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	1.5%	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
Howard	3	4.4%	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	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	25	36.8%	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
Prince George's	8	11.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	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	1.5%	0	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
St. Mary's	1	1.5%	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	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	4.4%	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	0	0.0%	0	0	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
Out-of-State	0	0.0%	0	0	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	68	100.0	3	2	6	4	2	0	7	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	25	8	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0
% of children from jurisdiction			100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children Statewide in all			4.4%	2.9%	8.8%	5.9%	2.9%	0.0%	10.3%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	4.4%	0.0%	36.8%	11.8%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Community, Living Arrangement

		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	Out-of-State	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	4	9.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Baltimore City	26	60.5%	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	3
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	7	16.3%	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	6	14.0%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	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
Out-of-State	0	0.0%	0	0	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	43	100.0%	0	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	9	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	5
% of children from 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			0.0%	4.7%	30.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.9%	0.0%	9.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	16.3%	11.6%

Non-Community, DETP

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	Out-of-State	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	1	4.2%	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
Baltimore	2	8.3%	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
Baltimore City	1	4.2%	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
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	1	4.2%	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
Charles	1	4.2%	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
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	4.2%	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
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	2	8.3%	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	0
Howard	2	8.3%	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	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	12.5%	0	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
Prince George's	2	8.3%	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
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	4.2%	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
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	2	8.3%	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	0
Wicomico	2	8.3%	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
Worcester	2	8.3%	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
Out-of-State	1	4.2%	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
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	24	100.0	0	0	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of children from jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	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%	37.5%	58.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

**Non-Community, Detention**

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	Out-of-State	Unknown
Allegany	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
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
Baltimore	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
Baltimore City	32	20.1%	10	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	3	1.9%	0	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
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	4	2.5%	2	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
Cecil	2	1.3%	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	5	3.1%	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	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	1.9%	1	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
Garrett	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
Harford	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
Howard	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
Kent	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
Montgomery	18	11.3%	11	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	49	30.8%	20	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	11	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	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
St. Mary's	3	1.9%	1	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
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	1.9%	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
Wicomico	5	3.1%	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
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
Out-of-State	1	0.6%	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
Grand Total	159	100.0	65	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of children from jurisdiction			50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children Statewide in all			40.9%	0.0%	0.0%	9.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.9%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	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**

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	Out-of-State	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	3	7.3%	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	2	0
Baltimore	1	2.4%	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	0
Baltimore City	15	36.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	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	3	7.3%	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	1	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	3	7.3%	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	2	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	2.4%	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	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	7.3%	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	3	0
Prince George's	8	19.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	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
Out-of-State	4	9.8%	0	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	41	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	0
% of children from 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%	100.0%	0.0%
% children Statewide in all			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	26.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	73.2%	0.0%

Non-Community, Residential Education

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	Out-of-State	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	0
Baltimore	4	8.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Baltimore City	4	8.5%	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	3	0	
Calvert	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	1	0	
Caroline	2	4.3%	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	1	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	2	4.3%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	1	2.1%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	6	12.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	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	6.4%	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Howard	1	2.1%	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	0	
Kent	2	4.3%	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	18	38.3%	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	
Prince George's	3	6.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	
Out-of-State	0	0.0%	0	0	0	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	47	100.0	0	0	1	0	0	12	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	
% of children from jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.8%	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%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	25.5%	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	19.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	36.2%	0.0%	0.0%	

Non-Community, RTC

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	Out-of-State	Unknown
Allegany	15	2.0%	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	46	6.2%	0	0	4	27	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Baltimore	123	16.6%	0	0	43	62	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	
Baltimore City	137	18.5%	0	0	64	54	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	
Calvert	5	0.7%	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Caroline	5	0.7%	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	15	2.0%	0	0	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Cecil	22	3.0%	0	0	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	8	1.1%	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	26	3.5%	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Frederick	35	4.7%	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	5	0.7%	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	37	5.0%	0	0	15	13	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	
Howard	15	2.0%	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Kent	7	0.9%	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	67	9.0%	0	0	10	20	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	78	10.5%	0	0	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	0	0	0	6	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	
Somerset	6	0.8%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	4	0.5%	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Talbot	14	1.9%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	24	3.2%	0	0	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Wicomico	34	4.6%	0	0	15	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	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	
Out-of-State	14	1.9%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	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	742	100.	0	0	234	260	0	0	0	0	0	66	79	0	0	0	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	0	
% of children from jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	35.0%	39.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.5%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	43.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	64.3%	0.0%
% children Statewide in all			0.0%	0.0%	31.5%	35.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.9%	10.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%	

Non-Community, ASAM

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	Out-of-State	Unknown
Allegany	2	0.5%	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	67	17.6%	16	7	7	0	1	0	12	0	0	3	5	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	5	0
Baltimore	53	13.9%	11	0	11	1	0	0	12	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	10	0
Baltimore City	80	21.1%	1	1	9	11	0	0	30	0	0	4	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	16	0
Calvert	11	2.9%	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Caroline	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
Carroll	13	3.4%	3	0	2	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	9	2.4%	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Charles	8	2.1%	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	2	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Frederick	11	2.9%	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	3.9%	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Howard	3	0.8%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	2	0.5%	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
Montgomery	21	5.5%	5	2	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0
Prince George's	39	10.3%	2	0	3	1	0	0	16	0	0	3	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
Queen Anne's	1	0.3%	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
Somerset	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	1	0
St. Mary's	6	1.6%	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	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	8	2.1%	1	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	11	2.9%	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Worcester	2	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Out-of-State	14	3.7%	0	0	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	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	380	100.0	63	13	50	16	2	0	90	0	2	20	15	35	1	0	3	6	2	0	0	1	0	14	0	2	45	0
% of children from jurisdiction			100.0%	10.4%	20.8%	13.8%	0.0%	0.0%	30.8%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	45.5%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	0.8%	19.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
% children Statewide in all			16.6%	3.4%	13.2%	4.2%	0.5%	0.0%	23.7%	0.0%	0.5%	5.3%	3.9%	9.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%	1.6%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%	0.5%	11.8%	0.0%

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	Out-of-State	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	2	12.5%	0	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	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	12.5%	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	1	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	0	0.0%	0	0	0	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	1	6.3%	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	
Dorchester	1	6.3%	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	
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	6.3%	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	18.8%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	4	25.0%	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
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	1	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	0	0	1	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	1	6.3%	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	
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	
Out-of-State	0	0.0%	0	0	0	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	16	100.0%	0	0	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	
% of children from 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%	0.0%	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			0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	6.3%	0.0%	

Hospitalization, General

		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	Out-of-State	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	11.1%	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	1	
Baltimore City	5	55.6%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	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	11.1%	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	
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	1	11.1%	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	1	11.1%	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	
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	
Out-of-State	0	0.0%	0	0	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	9	100.0%	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	
% of children from jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	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%
% children Statewide in all			0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	11.1%	

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	Out-of-State	Unknown
Allegany	3	0.9%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	4	1.2%	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	2
Baltimore	18	5.6%	0	0	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Baltimore City	170	52.8%	0	1	85	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	62
Calvert	3	0.9%	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	1
Caroline	2	0.6%	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	5	1.6%	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Cecil	6	1.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	4	1.2%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Dorchester	1	0.3%	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
Frederick	4	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	1	2
Garrett	11	3.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4
Harford	17	5.3%	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Howard	1	0.3%	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
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	15	4.7%	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2
Prince George's	34	10.6%	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	3
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	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
St. Mary's	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	0	0	2
Talbot	2	0.6%	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	1
Washington	16	5.0%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	3	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	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
Out-of-State	0	0.0%	0	0	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	322	100.0	2	4	114	10	2	1	6	5	1	2	2	7	12	3	1	5	19	0	0	1	1	17	3	0	17	87
% of children from jurisdiction			33.3%	50.0%	77.8%	5.9%	66.7%	50.0%	60.0%	83.3%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	45.5%	52.9%	100.0%	0.0%	20.0%	52.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	81.3%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% children Statewide in all			0.6%	1.2%	35.4%	3.1%	0.6%	0.3%	1.9%	1.6%	0.3%	0.6%	0.6%	2.2%	3.7%	0.9%	0.3%	1.6%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	5.3%	0.9%	0.0%	5.3%	27.0%