



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

**FY2015 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 15, 2015

Acknowledgements

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

Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

Eric English, Behavioral Health Administration
Susan Bradley, Behavioral Health Administration
Ceres Martin, Behavioral Health Administration
Janet Furman, Developmental Disabilities Administration
Bernard Zenis, Developmental Disabilities Administration

Department of Human Resources

Kary A. James, Social Services Administration
David Ayer, Social Services Administration
Maria Tillman, Social Services Administration
Sharon Henry, Social Services Administration

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

Governor's Office for Children

Arlene F. Lee, Executive Director
Kim Malat, Deputy Director
Christina Church, Policy Analyst
Patricia E. Arriaza, Chief of Policy
Alem Bayou, SCYFIS Database Manager

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

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Acknowledgements | 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 Summary..... | 27 |
| Department of Juvenile Services Summary..... | 47 |
| Developmental Disabilities Administration Summary | 67 |
| Behavioral Health Administration Summary | 75 |
| Maryland State Department of Education Summary | 84 |
| Maryland Schools for the Blind and for the Deaf | 91 |
| Family Preservation Services..... | 92 |
| APPENDIX: Placement by Jurisdiction | 104 |

Introduction & Overview

The State is responsible for providing children in out-of-home care with placements and services that meet their needs. The Out-of-Home Placement and Family Preservation Resource Plan (Report) is meant 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 [Residential Child Care Programs]" and the 2015 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 placement trends in Maryland, identify children's needs in Maryland, and describe how the agencies are meeting those needs. The Report contains information provided by the child-serving agencies, including the Departments of Human Resources, Health and Mental Hygiene, Juvenile Services, and the Maryland State Department of Education. 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. This year's report will also expand on the discussion of out-of-State placements to include an analysis of the policies and procedures related to placing a child out-of-State, as well as specific factors that led to placing children out-of-State during the most recent year.

Reasons for Placement: 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 by the court to be a Child In Need of Assistance, a Child In Need of Supervision, or Delinquent. Children can also enter placement through a Voluntary Placement Agreement under which a parent voluntarily places a child in the care of the State.

Placing Agencies: The State child-serving agencies and administrations responsible for placing children in out-of-home placements are the Departments of Human Resources; Juvenile Services; and Health and Mental Hygiene, including the Developmental Disabilities Administration and the Behavioral Health Administration. Although the Maryland State Department of Education funds out-of-home placements made by the Local School Systems, it is not a placing agency and does not place children out-of-home.

Funding for Placements: Placements are funded in a variety of ways. Children whose placements are funded by Education, 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, which is administered through Health and Mental Hygiene. Placements may also be co-funded by several State agencies.

Local Operations: Each of these child-placing and funding agencies and administrations operates differently at the local level. Health and Mental Hygiene (though Behavioral Health), Human Resources, and Education serve children and families through their 24 local counterparts within each of the State’s local jurisdictions - the local Department of Social Services, the local Core Service Agencies¹, the local Substance Abuse Councils, and the Local School Systems. Juvenile Services and Development Disabilities have regional offices, which, in turn, have local offices. For administrative purposes, Juvenile Services has six designated regions and Development Disabilities has four.

These regions are:

Juvenile Services

- 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)

Developmental Disabilities

- 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 year, 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. The Governor’s Office for Children (Office) 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.

¹ 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 fiscal year. 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:

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

FY2015: July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015

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

FY2011: January 31, 2011

FY2012: January 31, 2012

FY2013: January 31, 2013

FY2014: January 31, 2014

FY 2015: January 31, 2015

Age Group

This Report classifies placement for children through their 21st birthday (*i.e.*, to age 20.999) as of the date of admission for new placements, and as of July 1st of the fiscal year for carryover placements. There are two exceptions to this construct: 1) placements that are funded by Education include children who are served through the academic year of their 21st birthday; and 2) certain Behavioral Health placements that end at the child’s 18th 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 21st birthday.
- *“One-Day Census”* – The measurement of total population on one day out of the year. January 31st 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 FY2015 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).
- **Juvenile Services 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 Juvenile Services 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” Juvenile Services 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.
- **Juvenile Services Hospitalization Costs:** When a Juvenile Services-committed child is admitted to a psychiatric hospital, Juvenile Services 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.²
- **Residential Treatment Center Placements:** Because the population flow totals cannot be disaggregated, some placements may be double-counted within the Residential Treatment Center category. Residential Treatment Center placements reported by Juvenile Services are included in the Behavioral Health Residential Treatment Center placements. However, Department of Human Resources placements are not double-counts.

² Prior to 2013, this Report included total costs.

- **Behavioral Health Cost Data:** Behavioral Health services that are billed through Medicaid can be processed up to one year following the provision of the service, which is the time when Behavioral Health receives notice of expenditure. Costs that were incurred by Behavioral Health from the previous fiscal year but that are billed in the current fiscal year are reconciled in the 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.
- **Human Resources Cost Data:** Services that Human Resources bills through Medicaid for its placements are not reflected in the Human Resources cost tables and primarily include Residential Treatment Center placements. Instead, these costs appear in the Behavioral Health section. Additionally, Human Resources 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 Report is presented by the Office on behalf of 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 of 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. Recently, the Children’s Cabinet has been joined by three additional agencies, the Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation, the Department of Public Safety & Correctional Services, and the Governor’s Office of Crime Control & Prevention.

The FY2015 Report includes a Statewide summary of all out-of-home placements, five-year trend analyses, and strategies for out-of-home placements by the State agencies that place children or fund children’s placements, a description of placements at Maryland’s Schools for the Blind and the Deaf, and a discussion of Family Preservation Services.

The objective for the Report is to provide an accurate and precise analysis of each agency’s placement trends and future resource development priorities. The State Agencies continue 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 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).

| Family Home | Non-Community-Based |
|---|--|
| Adoptive Care Foster Care Formal Relative (Kinship – Non-Paid) Care Restricted Relative (Kinship - Paid) 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 |
| Community-Based | Hospitalization |
| 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 Human Resources and Juvenile Services place children in all the placement categories. Health and Mental Hygiene and its administrations (Behavioral Health and Developmental Disabilities) place children in only one category each. Education 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 1/31/2015 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 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 Programs | Non-Secure/Non-Residential Treatment Center | Residential Educational Facilities | Residential Treatment Centers | Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs | Living Arrangement – Non-Community-Based | In-Patient Private | Psychiatric Hospitalization |
| DHR ³ | 41 | 1024 | 557 | 293 | 1402 | 197 | 161 | 557 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 0 | 71 | 10 | 10 |
| DJS | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 13 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 125 | 27 | 0 | 105 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| MSDE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 45 | | | | | |
| BHA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 385 | N/A ⁴ | | | |
| DDA | | | | | | | | 19 | 62 | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 2

³ Eighty-nine youth were listed as “Runaways” and 239 youth were listed as “Unknown Whereabouts,” which generally means that their records were in the process of being updated when the data was pulled. These youth are not reflected in the placement categories above.

⁴ Due to unresolved issues related to merging Mental Hygiene’s Alcohol and Drug Abuse and Mental Hygiene Administrations into one agency (Behavioral Health Administration), this data was not complete and available in time for publication.

Organization of the Report

Out-of-Home Placement Summaries

The out-of-home placement portion of the FY2015 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 uses the same metrics to aid comparison among the varying populations served by the agencies, organized under the following headings:

- Summary: A brief overview of the agency's goals and metrics related to out-of-home placement in the current year and over time.
- 2015 Data Highlights: 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.
- Demographics: Trends and contextual narrative related to age, gender, and race.
- Placement Subcategory Trends: Contextual narrative related to changes or trends in subcategory placements (i.e., foster care vs. treatment foster care). This section also includes placement subcategory total costs and costs per bed-day for agencies with more than one placement category (Human Resources and Juvenile Services).
- Out-of-State Placements: This section is required of all agencies that place children out-of-State. The section has been expanded from past years and will include a discussion of each agency's policies and procedures for choosing to place a child out-of-State, as well as trends and factors that have led to out-of-State placements.
- Strategies: 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.

Maryland Schools 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.

Appendix: Placement by Jurisdiction

The number of children from each jurisdiction in Maryland who were in out-of-home placements on January 31, 2015 and where they were placed, by out-of-home placement subcategory.

Statewide Summary

The Maryland regulations addressing Human Resources' out-of-home placement program (Code of Maryland Regulations 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 | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Community-Based Residential Placement | 1,718 | 1,514 | 1,465 | 1,335 | 1,161 | 1,009 | -10.0% | -13.1% |
| Family Home Settings | 6,490 | 5,840 | 5,359 | 4,619 | 4,114 | 3,594 | -11.1% | -12.6% |
| Hospitalization | 31 | 43 | 18 | 31 | 25 | 25 | 6.7% | 0.0% |
| Non-Community Based Residential Placement | 1,686 | 1,646 | 1,531 | 1,514 | 1,482 | 1,095 | -7.7% | -26.1% |
| Placement Category Not Available | 435 | 336 | 302 | 324 | 322 | 328 | -4.9% | 1.9% |
| All Categories | 10,360 | 9,379 | 8,675 | 7,823 | 7,104 | 6,051 | -10.2% | -14.8% |

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 1,053.⁵ The most significant decrease has been in the Non-Community-Based Placement category, with a decrease of 26.1% from last fiscal year.

⁵ The number of non-community-based residential placements is higher than actual placements because Juvenile Services Residential Treatment Center placements (included in the number of non-community-based residential placements) are reported by both Juvenile Services and the Mental Hygiene Administration. Juvenile Services 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 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Family Home | 15,720 | 14,772 | 14,351 | 12,682 | 11,015 | 9,818 | -8.9% | -10.9% |
| Community-Based | 4,544 | 4,161 | 3,935 | 3,563 | 2,925 | 2,656 | -10.1% | -9.2% |
| Non-Community Based | 6,992 | 6,154 | 6,115 | 5,865 | 5,737 | 3,025 | -13.2% | -47.3% |
| Hospitalization | 307 | 292 | 306 | 393 | 337 | 344 | 3.2% | 2.1% |
| Not Available | 572 | 887 | 877 | 850 | 832 | 864 | 10.5% | 3.8% |
| Total | 28,135 | 26,266 | 25,584 | 23,353 | 20,846 | 16,707 | -9.7% | -19.9% |

Table 4

The total number of out-of-home placements each fiscal year has decreased by slightly more than 40% in the last five fiscal years and decreased nearly 20% between FYs 2014 and 2015. As shown in Table 5, 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 |
| 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 |
| 2015 | 6,623 | 10,087 | 16,707 | 10,787 | 5,923 |
| Three-Year Change | -26.9% | -39.0% | -33.9% | -37.2% | -29.6% |
| Average Yearly Change | -8.1% | -10.6% | -9.7% | -9.0% | -10.8% |
| Recent Year Change | -9.7% | -22.3% | -17.8% | -20.5% | -12.4% |

Table 5

The rate of new out-of-home placements has decreased (Table 6). Fiscal Year 2015 had a less than average rate of new out-of-home placements in the last four fiscal years, with 7.47 per 1,000 of Maryland children. While fluctuations in the rates can be common in jurisdictions with low populations, this year saw a decrease in placements in every jurisdiction. New out-of-home placements indicate children initially placed or 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 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | Three Year Change | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Allegany | 14.3 | 17.6 | 19.7 | 17.4 | 14.72 | -25% | 2% | -15% |
| Anne Arundel | 4.8 | 6.1 | 6.5 | 5.6 | 3.26 | -50% | -5% | -42% |
| Baltimore | 9.1 | 9.2 | 8.5 | 7.3 | 5.08 | -40% | -13% | -30% |
| Baltimore City | 42.7 | 50.7 | 43 | 36.4 | 28.84 | -33% | -8% | -21% |
| Calvert | 9.5 | 8.5 | 10.5 | 9.1 | 5.02 | -52% | -11% | -45% |
| Caroline | 14.0 | 13.1 | 10.1 | 11.4 | 7.81 | -23% | -12% | -31% |
| Carroll | 6.2 | 7.6 | 6.4 | 5.5 | 0.43 | -93% | -25% | -92% |
| Cecil | 13.2 | 15.3 | 16.1 | 17.9 | 7.65 | -52% | -6% | -57% |
| Charles | 7.6 | 7.8 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 6.62 | -11% | -3% | -15% |
| Dorchester | 12.1 | 11.9 | 17 | 11.2 | 11.48 | -32% | 2% | 3% |
| Frederick | 6.9 | 8.1 | 7.3 | 6.3 | 5.12 | -30% | -6% | -19% |
| Garrett | 15.1 | 24.8 | 21.1 | 17.1 | 17.38 | -18% | 8% | 2% |
| Harford | 8.1 | 9.8 | 9.3 | 9.2 | 7.21 | -22% | -2% | -22% |
| Howard | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3 | 2.9 | 1.95 | -35% | -8% | -33% |
| Kent | 9.5 | 7.7 | 6.7 | 8.1 | 5.64 | -16% | -10% | -30% |
| Montgomery | 5.1 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.2 | 3.43 | -30% | -9% | -18% |
| Prince George's | 5.7 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 6.3 | 5.37 | -22% | -1% | -15% |
| Queen Anne's | 6.6 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 2.8 | 0.64 | -92% | -31% | -77% |
| Somerset | 14.7 | 24.3 | 19.4 | 18.2 | 12.50 | -36% | 2% | -31% |
| St. Mary's | 11.5 | 10.2 | 8.3 | 9.1 | 7.06 | -15% | -11% | -22% |
| Talbot | 11.3 | 13.7 | 9.5 | 7.3 | 6.00 | -37% | -13% | -18% |
| Washington | 13.6 | 15.1 | 13 | 11.1 | 10.70 | -18% | -5% | -4% |
| Wicomico | 10.6 | 11.8 | 11.3 | 10.2 | 6.48 | -43% | -10% | -36% |
| Worcester | 12.3 | 10.4 | 8.7 | 10.5 | 8.22 | -6% | -8% | -22% |
| Total | 11.0 | 12.3 | 11.2 | 9.9 | 7.47 | -33% | -8% | -25% |

Table 6

One 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 his or her home jurisdiction or because Kinship and Family Foster Care is available away from the child's home. Of all the children placed in Maryland, Baltimore City is the location for 26.5% of out-of-home placements, followed by Baltimore County with 21.4% of all out-of-home placements (Table 7).

| 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 | 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 | 83 | 1.4% | 61 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| Anne Arundel | 235 | 3.9% | 11 | 70 | 39 | 43 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 16 | 6 |
| Baltimore | 660 | 10.9% | 7 | 7 | 321 | 192 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 26 | 15 | |
| Baltimore City | 2217 | 36.6% | 11 | 38 | 610 | 1124 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 18 | 8 | 51 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 62 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 63 | 75 | |
| Calvert | 74 | 1.2% | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 31 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Caroline | 40 | 0.7% | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Carroll | 71 | 1.2% | 5 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Cecil | 198 | 3.3% | 1 | 0 | 22 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 118 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 12 |
| Charles | 115 | 1.9% | 3 | 0 | 17 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 9 |
| Dorchester | 46 | 0.8% | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Frederick | 173 | 2.9% | 9 | 0 | 15 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 4 |
| Garrett | 34 | 0.6% | 5 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Harford | 258 | 4.3% | 2 | 1 | 34 | 25 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 13 | 13 |
| Howard | 82 | 1.4% | 0 | 1 | 27 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 6 |
| Kent | 17 | 0.3% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Montgomery | 515 | 8.5% | 5 | 6 | 37 | 32 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 24 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 235 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 19 | 19 |
| Prince George's | 645 | 10.7% | 20 | 3 | 61 | 32 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 16 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 302 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 66 | 20 | 20 |
| Queen Anne's | 4 | 0.1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Somerset | 40 | 0.7% | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| St. Mary's | 113 | 1.9% | 4 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Talbot | 32 | 0.5% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington | 224 | 3.7% | 12 | 0 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 4 |
| Wicomico | 95 | 1.6% | 1 | 0 | 18 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| Worcester | 37 | 0.6% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Out-of-State | 32 | 0.5% | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 11 | 0.2% | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 6051 | 100.0% | 158 | 131 | 1266 | 1566 | 45 | 65 | 61 | 149 | 80 | 60 | 185 | 73 | 215 | 13 | 16 | 299 | 485 | 4 | 22 | 52 | 12 | 247 | 66 | 6 | 302 | 194 |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 73.5% | 29.8% | 48.6% | 50.7% | 41.9% | 37.5% | 36.6% | 59.6% | 39.1% | 37.0% | 43.4% | 55.9% | 45.7% | 3.7% | 23.5% | 45.6% | 46.8% | 25.0% | 27.5% | 41.6% | 21.9% | 64.3% | 23.2% | 10.8% | 62.5% | 0.0% |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 2.6% | 2.2% | 20.9% | 25.9% | 0.7% | 1.1% | 1.0% | 2.5% | 1.3% | 1.0% | 3.1% | 1.2% | 3.6% | 0.2% | 0.3% | 4.9% | 8.0% | 0.1% | 0.4% | 0.9% | 0.2% | 4.1% | 1.1% | 0.1% | 5.0% | 3.2% |

Table 7

Out-of-State Placements

This year’s Report will examine systemic trends in out-of-State placements. It will not discuss individual cases. The individual agencies have shared additional details in their respective sections within this Report.


| Out-Of-State Placements by Agency on 1/31/2015 | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-------|----------------|
| | Community-Based Placements | Family Home | Hospitalization | Non-Community-Based Placements | Other | All Placements |
| Department of Human Resources | 47 | 78 | 4 | 28 | 21 | 178 |
| Department of Juvenile Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 84 |
| Developmental Disabilities Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Behavioral Health Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 26 |
| Maryland State Department of Education | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 |
| Total | 47 | 78 | 4 | 151 | 21 | 301 |

Table A

On January 1, 2015, there were 301 placements out-of-State. Of these, 78 were Family Home setting placements – e.g., youth were placed with relatives or adopted in another State. This is the least restrictive type of placement and the most preferable setting wherever possible.

Four placements were in hospitals. The State does not make the decision to place a youth out-of-State via Hospitalization. Instead, the decision to hospitalize is made by the child’s treating physician. The reasons for hospitalizing a child out of State often depend on geography. For example, a child who lives in Prince George’s County will almost always be hospitalized at Children’s National Medical Center in Washington, D.C. Likewise a child who is first admitted to a smaller, local hospital, such as Frederick Memorial Hospital, will often be transferred to Children’s National Medical Center.

Therefore, the focus of the Report is on the 219 youth placed out-of-State that are not in family homes or hospitals. Most often, when a youth is placed out of state, he or she has more than one factor contributing to the placement. For example, a youth with a history of fire setting may also have issues with aggression in facilities and a co-occurring medical diagnosis requiring treatment. It is rare for a youth to be sent out-of-State due to too few beds in a Maryland facility that can serve her or him in a community-based setting.



| Category | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Community-Based Residential Placement | 50 | 45 | 39 | 54 | 52 | 47 | 0.4% | -9.6% |
| Family Home Settings | 187 | 141 | 97 | 89 | 73 | 78 | -15.0% | 6.8% |
| Hospitalization | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | NA | -20.0% |
| Non-Community Based Residential Placement | 140 | 155 | 161 | 155 | 126 | 151 | 2.4% | 19.8% |
| Other | 3 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 17 | 21 | 292.6% | 23.5% |
| All Categories | 380 | 342 | 298 | 315 | 273 | 301 | -4.0% | 10.3% |

Table 8

Community-based placements are preferred over non-community-based placements wherever possible, because these placements are less restrictive. There were forty-seven (47) placements to community-based residential facilities. The overwhelming majority (43) of these community-based residential placements were to residential group homes, with three placements in Job Corps and one placement in college.

Child-placing agencies have reported to the Office that a significant number of community-based placements have been made to AdvoServ, a residential child care program that serves both boys and girls diagnosed with developmental disabilities that are too severe to be managed using traditional cognitive behavioral therapies. In December 2014, Human Resources reported that it was monitoring 34 placements of Maryland youth at AdvoServ's Delaware location, including seven youth whose home jurisdiction is on the Eastern Shore. AdvoServ's Delaware location can be more convenient to families living on the Eastern Shore who find it easier to maintain regular visits to AdvoServ than to a location in Central Maryland.

For other placements, AdvoServ provides necessary services for youth diagnosed with co-occurring medical and behavioral diagnoses. For example, for a youth diagnosed with severe behavioral issues that prevented her or him from managing diabetes, then the youth would require a placement that could both manage the diabetes and provide behavioral therapies.

For other community-based placements, the most common reasons for sending a youth out of State include:

- Multiple prior placement failures;
- Rejection by in-State providers due to pervasive or serious aggression against staff;

- Rejection by in-State providers due to a history of sexual offense or a new sexual offense;⁶
- An IQ too low for traditional cognitive behavioral therapies; or
- A history of fire setting.

Non-community-based placements increased by nearly one-fifth (19.8%). Non-community-based settings are more restrictive than community-based settings and include residential treatment centers, residential education facilities, and juvenile detention centers.

A small number of youth placed in non-community-based settings out of state are not placed due to adjudication by the court. The most common reason for their placement is failure to succeed in an in-State program. Nearly all these youth have co-occurring diagnoses, such as aggression and sexual acting-out, or they have multiple complex needs that require hyper-specific intervention, such as a residential education program that serves youth that are both medically fragile and possess low IQ, or a program for students who are deaf that manages medical and behavioral needs.

The most common reasons for out-of-State non-community-based placements are similar to the reasons for community-based settings: continued physical aggression against in-State facility staff or residents, very low IQ, and/or a history of fire setting. There are, however, other reasons particular to this type of placement. In Maryland, there is one hardware-secure facility for boys (Victor Cullen Center) and one for girls (J. DeWeese Carter Youth Facility). Generally speaking, a youth who has been committed to a secure facility in state has no other options if the in-State facility is no longer an appropriate placement. A youth who has been ejected from the in-State facility, or who successfully completes the program at an in-State facility and then re-offends, will be placed out of state. A youth at risk of going AWOL may be placed out of state on the theory that it is more difficult to go AWOL in an unknown setting than in a familiar one. This also permits the placement agency to select a less restrictive setting – staff-secure rather than hardware-secure – for youth at risk of AWOL.⁷

Other reasons for placing youth out of state include gang affiliation, the need to separate co-offenders, or the need for secure substance abuse treatment. There are some gaps in available services for these populations, though the numbers of youth affected are small – girls ordered by the court to a staff-secure facility and youth age 18 or older.⁸

⁶ Some Maryland providers will accept a youth with a history of sexual offense, but the youth must have an IQ high enough to receive cognitive behavioral therapy. A youth with a lower IQ could not be supported in-State.


⁷ These placements are categorized as “Non-Secure/Non-Residential Treatment Center.”

⁸ Some Maryland Residential Treatment Centers will accept older youth who are non-sex offenders, but there can be a shortage of beds. There is currently a discussion around altering the existing Certificate of Need to allow an existing provider to accept more non-sex offender older youth, which would permit the State to bring some youth back, provided that the youth are not rejected by the private facilities for other reasons.

In-State and Out-of-State Costs

Overall, placement costs for both in-State and out-of-State placements 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.


For FY2015, costs are up by 14.2%, with the cost of non-community-based residential placement driving the increase. The cost of out-of-State placements has not contributed to the recent increase. Although out-of-State costs have increased 4.3% since 2010 they have decreased by 3.9% from last year (see Table 21).



| Statewide Total Costs | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Category | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Community-Based Residential Placement | \$145,760,440 | \$122,210,854 | \$117,152,599 | \$115,749,751 | \$104,784,520 | \$82,659,681 | -10.4% | -21.1% |
| Family Home Settings | \$154,528,388 | \$136,152,905 | \$130,233,996 | \$122,415,468 | \$122,192,288 | \$107,141,111 | -6.9% | -12.3% |
| Hospitalization | \$97,064 | \$28,977 | \$14,946 | \$41,220 | \$2,082 | \$0 ⁹ | -27.5% | -100.0% |
| Non-Community Based Residential Placement | \$156,486,635 | \$139,430,318 | \$147,085,835 | \$138,213,891 | \$63,113,560 | \$141,443,480 | 11.7% | 124.1% |
| All Categories | \$456,872,528 | \$397,823,054 | \$394,487,375 | \$376,420,330 | \$290,092,450 | \$331,353,710 | -5.4% | 14.2% |

Table 9

⁹ Placements at psychiatric hospitals are not paid by State agencies. Agencies pay for any education costs and Medical Assistance or private insurance pays for the residential costs. In past years, the hospitalization costs included the cost of placement in non-psychiatric hospitals and some residential costs where a placement was made in the middle of a month and therefore was not covered by Medical Assistance or private insurance.



| Statewide Costs Per Bed Day | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------------|------------------|
| Category | FY2010 | FY2011 | FY2012 | FY2013 | FY2014 | FY2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Community-Based Residential Placement | \$233 | \$219 | \$226 | \$236 | \$297 | \$216 | 6.9% | 25.8% |
| Family Home Settings | \$94 | \$90 | \$95 | \$102 | \$165 | \$148 | 17.6% | 61.8% |
| Hospitalization | \$141 | \$99 | \$168 | \$118 | <\$1 | \$0 | NA | NA |
| Non-Community Based Residential Placement | \$385 | \$329 | \$366 | \$338 | \$340 | \$515 | -2.6% | 0.6% |
| All Categories | \$171 | \$160 | \$172 | \$179 | \$227 | \$293 | 8.0% | 26.8% |

Table 10


Statewide Strategies

Maryland’s child and family-serving agencies provide a continuum of care to meet an array of needs along a wide spectrum. A goal of the Report is to ensure that the State is using data to drive its policies related to out-of-home placements. In the remainder of this Report, State agencies will describe how they meet the needs of the children in their care and the challenges faced. The following is a summary of the State agencies’ strategies for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the State network.

| Agency | Strategies |
|---|--|
| Department of Human Resources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer options for substance abuse treatment programs that accept parents and children together. • 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. • Support evidence-based programs such as <i>SafeCare</i>, <i>Functional Family Therapy</i>, <i>Incredible Years</i>, and <i>Nurturing Parenting</i> to promote family preservation - multi-faceted, community-based programs for families experiencing difficulty in meeting the basic needs of their children and at-risk for child emotional and/or physical neglect. |
| Department of Juvenile Services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the Continuum of Care statute to ensure that the agency 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. • Support Department of Juvenile Services capital projects to ensure that sufficient in-State secure slots are available for high-risk committed youth. |
| Developmental Disabilities Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify youth early before they age out of support systems and transition planning. • Continue to work with other administrations and community resources to allow children to remain in their homes. |
| Maryland State Department of Education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to work with Maryland providers of services to children diagnosed with autism through the Autism Waiver. • Continue to support local school systems to enhance services and supports for students to remain in their community schools. • 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. |
| Behavioral Health Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue efforts to minimize out-of-State placements through the implementation of a 1915(i) Medicaid State Plan amendment providing intensive services using a wraparound model. • Continue to assess the feasibility of in-State Residential Treatment Centers offering specialized services such as treatment for fire-setting and sexually offensive behavior. |

STATEWIDE Addendum


Maryland State Placement Trends by Category



Statewide Family Home Settings Placement Trends

| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Adoptive Care | 98 | 60 | 47 | 37 | 32 | 41 | -13.4% | 28.1% |
| Foster Care | 1,473 | 1,365 | 1,327 | 1,185 | 1,132 | 1,029 | -6.9% | -9.1% |
| Formal Relative (Kinship) Care | 1,460 | 1,316 | 1,207 | 936 | 761 | 557 | -17.2% | -26.8% |
| Restricted Relative (Kinship) Care | 854 | 634 | 491 | 382 | 326 | 293 | -19.1% | -10.1% |
| Treatment Foster Care | 2,152 | 2,100 | 1,981 | 1,757 | 1,627 | 1,477 | -7.2% | -9.2% |
| Living Arrangement - Family Home | 453 | 365 | 306 | 322 | 236 | 197 | -14.7% | -16.5% |
| Total | 6,490 | 5,840 | 5,359 | 4,619 | 4,114 | 3,594 | -11.1% | -12.6% |


Table 11



Statewide Non-Community-Based Settings Placement Trends

| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program | 12 | 15 | 14 | 25 | 24 | 6 | 3.6% | -75.0% |
| Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers | 178 | 166 | 160 | 185 | 159 | 125 | -6.0% | -21.4% |
| Non-Secure/Non-Residential Treatment Center | 23 | 35 | 45 | 39 | 41 | 27 | 7.7% | -34.1% |
| Residential Educational Facilities | 59 | 44 | 58 | 53 | 47 | 45 | -3.6% | -4.3% |
| Residential Treatment Centers | 914 | 826 | 719 | 729 | 722 | 669 | -5.9% | -7.3% |
| Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs | 400 | 438 | 429 | 387 | 359 | 152 | -13.4% | -57.7% |
| Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based | 100 | 122 | 106 | 96 | 89 | 71 | -5.6% | -20.2% |
| Total | 1,686 | 1,646 | 1,531 | 1,514 | 1,441 | 1,095 | -7.9% | -24.0% |


Table 13



Statewide Community-Based Placement Trends

| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Independent Living Programs | 261 | 234 | 213 | 230 | 201 | 174 | -7.5% | -13.4% |
| Residential Child Care Program | 1,264 | 1,105 | 1,108 | 966 | 849 | 738 | -10.1% | -13.1% |
| Community Supported Living Arrangement | 117 | 96 | 84 | 81 | 68 | 62 | -11.8% | -8.8% |
| Living Arrangement - Community-Based | 76 | 79 | 60 | 58 | 43 | 35 | -13.6% | -18.6% |
| Total | 1,718 | 1,514 | 1,465 | 1,335 | 1,161 | 1,009 | -10.0% | -13.1% |

Table 12




Statewide Hospitalization Trends

| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| In-Patient Private | 6 | 16 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 35.8% | 11.1% |
| Psychiatric Hospitalization | 25 | 27 | 13 | 25 | 16 | 15 | 1.2% | -6.3% |
| Total | 31 | 43 | 18 | 31 | 25 | 25 | 6.7% | 0.0% |

Table 14

STATEWIDE Addendum Statewide Demographic Comparisons


Age



| Statewide Age Trends | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Age | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| 0 through 5 | 1,953 | 1,647 | 1,616 | 1,481 | 1,346 | 1,227 | -27.0% | -8.8% |
| 6 through 11 | 1,562 | 1,306 | 1,116 | 1,034 | 881 | 857 | -30.6% | -2.7% |
| 12 through 17 | 4,481 | 3,972 | 3,639 | 3,201 | 2,631 | 2,481 | -29.9% | -5.7% |
| 18 and over | 2,364 | 2,454 | 2,304 | 2,107 | 1,891 | 1,486 | -24.2% | -21.4% |
| Total | 10,360 | 9,379 | 8,675 | 7,823 | 6,749 | 6,051 | -28.1% | -10.3% |

Table 15


Gender



| Statewide Gender Trends | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Gender | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Male | 5,766 | 5,285 | 4,815 | 4,370 | 3,768 | 3,341 | -10.3% | -11.3% |
| Female | 4,593 | 4,093 | 3,859 | 3,453 | 2,979 | 2,706 | -10.0% | -9.2% |
| Unknown | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | NA | 100.0% |
| Total | 10,360 | 9,379 | 8,675 | 7,823 | 6,749 | 6,051 | -10.2% | -10.3% |

Table 16

Race




| Statewide Race Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Race | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| American Indian / Alaskan | 10 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | -6.9% | 16.7% |
| Asian | 33 | 33 | 30 | 32 | 34 | 28 | 1.0% | 6.3% |
| Black or African American | 7,131 | 6,289 | 5,643 | 4,949 | 4,203 | 3,662 | -12.4% | -15.1% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | -10.0% | 0.0% |
| White | 2,489 | 2,383 | 2,388 | 2,247 | 1,952 | 1,781 | -5.8% | -13.1% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 309 | 279 | 267 | 236 | 233 | 259 | -6.7% | -1.3% |
| Other | 252 | 238 | 227 | 220 | 191 | 181 | -6.6% | -13.2% |
| Unknown | 131 | 145 | 109 | 130 | 126 | 130 | 0.5% | -3.1% |
| Total | 10,360 | 9,379 | 8,675 | 7,823 | 6,749 | 6,051 | -10.1% | -13.7% |

STATEWIDE Addendum

Statewide Out-of-State One-Day Comparisons

Age




Maryland Out-of-State Age Trends

| Age | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| 0 through 5 | 69 | 44 | 28 | 29 | 39 | 30 | -11.5% | -23.1% |
| 6 through 11 | 44 | 31 | 25 | 28 | 13 | 16 | -13.5% | 23.1% |
| 12 through 17 | 154 | 169 | 155 | 146 | 116 | 155 | 1.7% | 33.6% |
| 18 and over | 113 | 98 | 90 | 112 | 105 | 100 | -1.6% | -4.8% |
| Total | 380 | 342 | 298 | 315 | 273 | 301 | -4.0% | 10.3% |

Table 18

Gender




Maryland Out-of-State Gender Trends

| Gender | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Male | 253 | 246 | 221 | 218 | 187 | 213 | -2.9% | 13.9% |
| Female | 127 | 96 | 77 | 97 | 84 | 88 | -5.4% | 4.8% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | NA | -100.0% |
| Total | 380 | 342 | 298 | 315 | 273 | 301 | -4.0% | 10.3% |

Table 19

Race



Maryland Out-of-State Race Trends

| Race | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| American Indian / Alaskan | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Asian | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | NA | NA |
| Black or African American | 239 | 235 | 216 | 223 | 180 | 192 | -3.8% | 6.7% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| White | 121 | 87 | 69 | 74 | 74 | 83 | -5.9% | 12.2% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 7 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 5.7% | 0.0% |
| Other | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 15 | 22.5% | 66.7% |
| Unknown | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 13.3% | 0.0% |
| Total | 380 | 342 | 298 | 315 | 273 | 301 | -4.0% | 10.3% |

Table 20

STATEWIDE Addendum

Statewide Out-of-State Cost Comparisons

Total Costs




Table 21

Per Bed-Day




Table 22

Department of Human Resources Summary

The Department of Human Resources prioritizes child safety, permanency, and well-being for children and families. It 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 inception of the Place Matters initiative, the number of children in Human Resources out-of-home care has decreased 53% (10,330 in July 2007 to 4,837 in June 2015).¹⁰

Maryland's Family-Centered Practice model is a fundamental component of the Department of Human Resources' 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 the goal of increasing families' capacities to protect their children. Family Involvement Meetings 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 out-of-home placement is necessary, the first choice is always a family home (family foster home or relative placement).

Family Involvement Meetings 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 out-of-home placement or reduce time in out-of-home care.


Most children – an average of 74% over the last six years – in Human Resources out-of-home 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.

2015 Data Highlights

The number of children in Human Resources out-of-home care is at its lowest point in over 27 years, with a 43% reduction since 2010 and a 53% reduction since 2007.¹¹ In 2015, 72% of children/youth in Human Resources out-of-home care were in family homes, with another 15% in community-based placements (Table 23).

¹⁰ Governor's Office of Performance Improvement Place Matters data June 2015; Human Resources.


¹¹ Governor's Office of Performance Improvement Place Matters data June 2015; Human Resources.



| Human Resources Placement Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Category | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Community-Based Residential Placement | 1,321 | 1,170 | 1,116 | 978 | 842 | 753 | -10.6% | -10.6% |
| Family Home Settings | 6,397 | 5,765 | 5,286 | 4,548 | 4,024 | 3,514 | -11.3% | -12.7% |
| Hospitalization | 23 | 38 | 11 | 22 | 17 | 20 | 17.8% | 17.6% |
| Non-Community-Based Residential Placement | 339 | 306 | 299 | 279 | 272 | 250 | -5.9% | -8.1% |
| Placement Category Not Available | 435 | 336 | 302 | 324 | 322 | 328 | -4.9% | 1.9% |
| All Categories | 8,515 | 7,615 | 7,014 | 6,151 | 5,477 | 4,865 | -10.6% | -11.2% |

Table 23

Across all 24 Maryland jurisdictions, 55% of all children in Human Resources out-of-home care are placed in their home jurisdiction (Table 26). 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 outside of the home jurisdiction (or out-of-State) may be preferable to non-relative placements within the home jurisdiction.



| Human Resources Total Served | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------------|------------------|
| Category | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Family Home | 15,510 | 14,564 | 14,178 | 12,498 | 11,039 | 9,661 | -9.0% | -12.5% |
| Community-Based | 3,592 | 3,317 | 3,074 | 2,719 | 2,235 | 2,029 | -10.7% | -9.2% |
| Non-Community-Based | 831 | 794 | 755 | 751 | 675 | 625 | -5.5% | -7.4% |
| Hospitalization | 237 | 208 | 232 | 297 | 294 | 260 | 2.9% | -11.6% |
| Not Available | 572 | 887 | 877 | 850 | 866 | 864 | 10.5% | -0.2% |
| Total | 20,742 | 19,770 | 19,116 | 17,115 | 15,109 | 13,439 | -8.2% | -11.1% |

Table 24

Nearly half (42%) of children in Human Resources out-of-home care come from Baltimore City. Another 28% come from the following Counties: Baltimore (11%), Prince George’s (9%), and Montgomery (8%). More than 60% of placements within Prince George’s County were of children from Prince George’s County and 54% of Montgomery County placements were of children from Montgomery County as of January 31, 2015. Baltimore City had 55% of their children in care placed within its jurisdiction. Each other local jurisdiction had less than 5% each of the total Human Resources out-of-home population (Table 26).

| Human Resources 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 |
| 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 |
| 2015 | 5,248 | 8,191 | 13,439 | 8,635 | 4,804 |
| Three-Year Change | -25.60% | -22.20% | -23.60% | -20.00% | -29.40% |
| Average Yearly Change | -9.9% | -8.6% | -9.1% | -8.2% | -10.6% |
| Recent Year Change | -11.3% | -10.9% | -11.1% | -12.0% | -9.3% |

Table 25

Human Resources Placement By Jurisdiction


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 | 67 | 1% | 53 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | |
| Anne Arundel | 152 | 3% | 0 | 69 | 19 | 23 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 6 | |
| Baltimore | 541 | 11% | 3 | 7 | 288 | 142 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 15 | |
| Baltimore City | 2020 | 42% | 4 | 37 | 567 | 1103 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 50 | 30 | 0 | 11 | 59 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 41 | 75 | |
| Calvert | 64 | 1% | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 28 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Caroline | 30 | 1% | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | |
| Carroll | 47 | 1% | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | |
| Cecil | 177 | 4% | 0 | 0 | 16 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 117 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 12 | |
| Charles | 85 | 2% | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | |
| Dorchester | 29 | 1% | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | |
| Frederick | 103 | 2% | 2 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | |
| Garrett | 26 | 1% | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | |
| Harford | 221 | 5% | 0 | 0 | 27 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 13 | |
| Howard | 61 | 1% | 0 | 1 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | |
| Kent | 10 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Montgomery | 372 | 8% | 1 | 5 | 27 | 18 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 17 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 201 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 19 | |
| Prince George's | 462 | 9% | 1 | 1 | 36 | 24 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 16 | 288 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 20 | |
| Queen Anne's | 3 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Somerset | 29 | 1% | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | |
| St. Mary's | 88 | 2% | 0 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | |
| Talbot | 24 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Washington | 186 | 4% | 4 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4 | |
| Wicomico | 29 | 1% | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 4 | 0 | |
| Worcester | 28 | 1% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 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 | 11 | 0% | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Grand Total | 4865 | 100% | 69 | 125 | 1062 | 1375 | 42 | 49 | 51 | 144 | 78 | 30 | 98 | 31 | 213 | 77 | 8 | 254 | 462 | 4 | 21 | 51 | 12 | 191 | 40 | 6 | 178 | 194 | |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 79% | 45% | 53% | 55% | 44% | 47% | 45% | 66% | 51% | 41% | 46% | 69% | 53% | 23% | 40% | 54% | 62% | 33% | 34% | 52% | 29% | 72% | 55% | 14% | N/A | 0% | |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 1% | 3% | 22% | 28% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 4% | 2% | 0% | 5% | 9% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 4% | 1% | 0% | 4% | 4% | |

Table 26

Human Resources Demographics


Although there is still a significant gap, the percentages of Black/African-American children in Human Resources out-of-home care has decreased over the past several years while the proportions of White children has increased. In 2010, 71% of children in Human Resources out-of-home care were Black/African-American; in 2015, the percentage fell to 60%. In 2010, 22% of children in Human Resources out-of-home care were White; in 2015, 29% were White (Table 29). Gender remains nearly evenly split between males and females (Table 27).



| Human Resources All Categories Gender Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Gender | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Male | 4,388 | 3,922 | 3,531 | 3,099 | 2,754 | 2,456 | -10.00% | -11.10% |
| Female | 4,127 | 3,692 | 3,482 | 3,052 | 2,721 | 2,407 | -8.50% | -10.80% |
| Unknown | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | NA | NA |
| Total | 8,515 | 7,615 | 7,014 | 6,151 | 5,477 | 4,865 | -9.30% | -11.00% |


Table 27

As of January 31, 2015, 25% of children in Human Resources out-of-home care were age 5 and younger; 16% were ages 6 to 11; 33% were ages 12 to 17; and 25% were age 18 and older. These proportions are similar to last year's data (Table 28). Fifty-eight percent of youth in Human Resources out-of-home care are over the age of 11; this has significant implications for placement needs and challenges. Foster parent skills, therapeutic treatments, and other service needs of older children and youth are different than that of infants, toddlers, and young children.



| Human Resources All Categories Age Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Age | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| 0 through 5 | 1,952 | 1,647 | 1,615 | 1,480 | 1,346 | 1,226 | -8.7% | -8.9% |
| 6 through 11 | 1,516 | 1,245 | 1,058 | 930 | 870 | 799 | -12.9% | -8.2% |
| 12 through 17 | 3,201 | 2,784 | 2,476 | 2,046 | 1,812 | 1,628 | -12.6% | -10.2% |
| 18 and over | 1,846 | 1,939 | 1,865 | 1,695 | 1,449 | 1,212 | -7.8% | -16.4% |
| Total | 8,515 | 7,615 | 7,014 | 6,151 | 5,477 | 4,865 | -10.6% | -11.2% |

Table 28



| Human Resources All Categories Race Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Race | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| American Indian / Alaskan | 7 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | -0.2% | 0.0% |
| Asian | 23 | 24 | 20 | 15 | 23 | 17 | -2.0% | -26.1% |
| Black or African American | 6,085 | 5,270 | 4,705 | 3,988 | 3,449 | 2,940 | -13.5% | -14.8% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | -4.7% | 0.0% |
| White | 1,843 | 1,792 | 1,809 | 1,698 | 1,543 | 1,427 | -4.9% | -7.5% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 309 | 278 | 264 | 232 | 229 | 257 | -3.3% | 12.2% |
| Other | 137 | 139 | 136 | 112 | 103 | 101 | -5.7% | -1.9% |
| Unknown | 106 | 105 | 74 | 99 | 122 | 115 | 4.2% | -5.7% |
| Total | 8,515 | 7,615 | 7,014 | 6,151 | 5,477 | 4,865 | -10.6% | -11.2% |

Table 29

Human Resources Placement Subcategory Trends

Tables 24 and 25 show data on placements and include data on new entries into Human Resources out-of-home care, placement changes among children already in Human Resources out-of-home care, and children exiting Human Resources out-of-home 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 in Tables 24 and 25; therefore, a child may be counted multiple times.)

It should be noted that these placement changes are often 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 followed by placement in a group home or foster home.

As the total Human Resources out-of-home care population has decreased since July 2007, the numbers of family home and community-based placements has correspondingly decreased. Table 23 shows a total Human Resources out-of-home population decrease of 43% from 2010 to 2015; there was a corresponding 45% decrease in family home placements and a 43% decrease in community-based placements. The 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 13% decrease in hospitalizations and a 26% decrease in non-community-based placements since FY2010.

Family homes (for Human Resources) 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 in FY2015 are seen in adoptive care (58.2%), formal relative (kinship) care (61.8%), and restrictive relative (kinship) care (65.7%) placements since FY2010. Adoption, however, has increased 22% since FY2014. Meanwhile, although the counts of children placed in formal relative (kinship) care and treatment foster care have decreased, the proportion of children in these placements (out of all Human Resources placements) has been increasing (Table 31).

Care must be taken when interpreting Family Home data, as it includes information about placements with kinship, regular, and private providers. Table 31 shows that 30% of Family Home placements are with relatives: Formal Relative (non-paid Kinship) Care, Restrictive Relative (paid Kinship Care), or Living Arrangement-Family Home (primarily trial home visits). Meanwhile, another 1% are adoptive homes, 41% are Treatment Foster Care placements (the majority of which are private providers), and 29% are regular foster care which typically are public homes (i.e., approved by the local Department of Social Services).

Table 32 shows community-based placements comprise Human Resources' second-most utilized placement type; an average of 15% of all Human Resources children/youth are in community-based placements. For Human Resources, this includes: college, Job Corps, independent living residential programs, and residential child care programs (group homes).

Fifty-five percent of all children/youth in Human Resources out-of-home care as of January 31, 2015, were older than age 17 (see Table 36); thus, college, JobCorps, and independent living placements are age-appropriate for this population and the least restrictive. Youth age 18 and older have a choice to remain in Human Resources out-of-home care; 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 Human Resources out-of-home care are placed in the State's most restrictive placements (hospitalizations), while an average of 5% are in non-community-based placements such as Residential Treatment Centers, Correctional Institutions, or Secure Detention (Table 37-38). 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 (Table 23) – this includes children classified as runaway, as well as children whose placement data has not been fully entered into MD CHESSIE (Human Resources’ child welfare information system).

Human Resources Out-of-State Placements

As the overall number of children placed in Human Resources out-of-home care decreases so does the overall number for children placed out of state. As of January 31, 2015, four percent (4%) of Human Resources’ out-of-home population was in out-of-State placement (178 children). As illustrated in Table 47 through Table 49, when compared to years prior, the count of children placed out of state in family homes continues to decline, and the number of children in community-based placements holds relatively steady; while non-community-based placements have increased.

Nearly half of the children placed out of state (78) were placed in family home placements (Table 47.). Twenty-six percent (26%) of the children placed out of state were placed in community-based placements, primarily residential child care (group home) placements but also independent living, college, and JobCorps placements (Table 48).

Of the children placed out of state, 35% were 18 years of age or older. Fifty-five percent of children in community-based placement were over the age of 18 (Table 51). Further, nearly 90% of children placed in family home settings were under the age of 18 (Table 50).

A key factor in determining whether a child will be placed out of state is based upon the needs of the child. It is important to note that the lack of adequate services and facilities within the State makes it increasingly difficult to keep these children in Maryland. Children placed in Residential Treatment Centers and group home facilities out of state possess complex physical, mental, psychiatric, and educational needs. Of these children, many of them have been prescribed multiple psychotropic medications, have been diagnosed with one or more conditions including but not limited to: autism, developmental disabilities, mental health conditions, emotional disturbances, and/or learning disabilities. It is not uncommon for children placed in these out of state settings to lack verbal skills and to possess IQs below moderate range.

Residential Treatment Centers and group homes with expertly trained staff that are fully-equipped and experienced in treating severe medical issues, developmental disabilities with additional complicating factors, and sex offenders do not exist in Maryland. Therefore, when youth committed to Human Resources’ present with these serious challenges, an out-of-State placement is the most effective in serving children diagnosed with serious co-occurring disorders, such as behavioral and mental health needs..


Human Resources Costs

Human Resources 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. Medical Assistance pays for hospitalizations, as well as the residential portion of Residential Treatment Center placements (non-community based); the other non-community based placements of secure detention and commitment are mandated and paid for by the juvenile justice system for youth who are detained, charged, and adjudicated.

Over the past six fiscal years, Human Resources' residential costs have continued to decrease, with an average annual decrease of 7%, and an overall decrease of 30% since FY2010 (Table 30). In FY2010, the costs were just over \$360 million. In FY2013, residential costs were just below \$200 million, for the first time in several years; in FY2015, these costs decreased to just under \$169 million, nearly a one hundred million dollar decrease since FY2010 (Table 30).


Total costs, which includes residential as well as education and administrative costs, also continue to decrease. The average annual decrease of total costs is 7%, and an overall decrease of 30% since FY2010, to \$252 million in FY2015. Education costs have decreased from \$9.4 million in FY2010 to \$7.6 million in FY2015, while administrative costs have decreased 15% from \$89 million in FY2010 to \$76 million in FY2015.

Community-based placements continue to have higher per bed-day cost than family home placements (Table 31), with a FY2015 average bed-day cost of \$265, compared to \$105 for family home placements (only paid placements were included in these averages). While the per diem costs for community-based placements is higher than the family based placements, it is important to note that overall cost of community-based placements comprise 40% of all Human Resources residential placements costs while the cost of family homes comprise 60%, due to the larger number of family home paid placements.



| Human Resources Cost Trends | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Cost Type | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change | 2010-2015 Change |
| Total | \$362,826,762 | \$350,625,684 | \$309,430,208 | \$282,614,057 | \$278,030,287 | \$252,426,663 | -6.4% | -9.2% | -30.4% |
| Residential | \$264,644,544 | \$255,439,051 | \$215,361,539 | \$199,942,040 | \$194,867,565 | \$169,083,401 | -7.2% | -13.2% | -36.1% |
| Educational | \$9,439,103 | \$8,972,787 | \$7,854,822 | \$6,799,657 | \$7,966,645 | \$7,578,736 | -3.4% | -4.9% | -19.7% |
| Administrative | \$88,743,115 | \$86,213,846 | \$86,213,846 | \$75,872,360 | \$75,196,077 | \$75,764,526 | -3.9% | 0.8% | -14.6% |
| % Residential | 73% | 73% | 70% | 71% | 70% | 67% | | | |
| % Educational | 3% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 3% | 3% | | | |
| % Administrative | 24% | 25% | 28% | 27% | 27% | 30% | | | |

Table 30



| Human Resources All Categories Cost Per Bed-Day Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------------|------------------|
| Category | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Community-Based Residential Placement | \$250 | \$229 | \$233 | \$244 | \$278 | \$265 | 3.0% | -4.7% |
| Family Home Settings | \$92 | \$88 | \$93 | \$99 | \$111 | \$105 | 5.0% | -5.4% |
| 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 | \$127 | \$118 | \$124 | \$132 | \$146 | \$206 | 3.8% | 41.1% |

Table 31

Human Resources Strategies

The primary goal of Human Resources is to prevent maltreatment and out-of-home placement of children and youth. Although an out-of-home placement may be necessary to protect a child's safety, family reunification is the preferred goal; therefore, services that can support these goals are the priority of Human Resources.

Human Resources has identified the following critical areas for increased services:

- Reduce the number of children who enter out-of-home care;
- Reduce the number of children who re-enter out-of-home care; and
- Children with substance abuse-involved parents.

Human Resources has a number of initiatives designed to address these critical service areas; the Title IV E Waiver, Performance-based contracting for group homes, Family-centered Practice, Place Matters, Ready by 21, Youth Matter, Alternative Response and Tuition Waivers. The Title IV-E Waiver will focus on strengthening the family at its core; thereby reducing the overall number of children in care; the number of children re-entering care; and addressing the challenge of children with parents who are addicted or dependent on substances. Below are programs and services to address these issues:

1. *Family Preservation*: Human Resources will expand intensive family preservation and post-permanency services, including both prevention and post-permanency services.
2. *Trauma-informed Care*: Human Resources 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. *SafeCare*: An in-home 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.
4. *Functional Family Therapy*: Functional Family Therapy is designed for children ages 11 to 18 with behavioral health problems including conduct disorders and substance abuse. Functional Family Therapy improves family relationships by teaching families how to promote the safety of their children, improve communication skills and skills for solving family problems.
5. *Trauma Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy*: This model of psychotherapy for both child and parent participation is designed for children ages 3 to 18 who are experiencing negative effects from trauma events and who are experiencing symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, depression, anxiety, grief, or trauma-related shame. The treatment focuses on psycho-education and parenting skills, relaxation techniques, emotional expression and processing/regulation, and coping abilities.


6. *Parent-Child Interaction Therapy*: Parent-Child Interaction Therapy is a behavioral intervention that focuses on decreasing behavior problems, improving child social skills and cooperation, and securing the attachment between parent and child. This model focuses on children ages 2 to 7 with behavior problems and parent-child relationship problems.
7. *Nurturing Parenting*: A group-based and family-centered program proposed for parent and child, ages 5 to 12, who have been reported to the child welfare system. This treatment model focuses on parenting methods contributing to attachment problems, disciplinary problems, neglect of child's basic needs, and lack of supervision. Services to children include targeting and addressing: feelings of low self-worth, bully-like or victim-like behaviors, overprotective or withdrawn behavior, and separation anxiety.
8. *Incredible Years*: Incredible Years is focused on strengthening parent competencies in a group-based setting. This program promotes young children's social, emotion, and academic competencies and prevents the development of conduct problems. The population is high-risk children ages 2 to 12 and their parents.

As a result of obtaining the Title IV-E Waiver, Human Resources will be able to more effectively achieve the goals of safety, permanence and well-being. In particular, the Title IV-E Waiver will accelerate Human Resources' shift of resources to the "front end" of its service system – to impact families positively at earlier points in time to avoid negative outcomes such as indicated maltreatment and foster care placement. Accompanying this paradigm shift, Human Resources will increase the agency's sensitivity to trauma among children, families, and caseworkers, in order to become a trauma-informed service system.

Challenges: Human Resources continues to face challenges as the needs of children and families change. Through the IV E Waiver process, Human Resources has identified the following gaps in services:


- Services and placements for child victims of human sex trafficking.
- Foster and adoptive parents for teens, sibling groups, medically-fragile children, and Spanish-speaking children.
- Community services for all families – mental health, substance abuse, anger management, and financial management.
- Transportation– both intra- and inter-jurisdiction 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 children diagnosed with co-occurring issues such as developmental disabilities and mental health disorders; particularly for those who enter out-of-home care through a Voluntary Placement Agreement and children who are medically-fragile.
- Substance abuse treatment programs that accept parents and children together.

Human Resources Addendum Subcategory One-Day Census Totals Placement Trends




| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Adoptive Care | 98 | 60 | 47 | 37 | 32 | 41 | -13.4% | 28.1% |
| Foster Care | 1,466 | 1,358 | 1,321 | 1,180 | 1,128 | 1,024 | -6.8% | -9.0% |
| Formal Relative (Kinship) Care | 1,460 | 1,316 | 1,207 | 936 | 761 | 557 | -17.2% | -26.8% |
| Restrictive Relative (Kinship) Care | 854 | 634 | 491 | 382 | 326 | 293 | -19.1% | -10.1% |
| Treatment Foster Care | 2,066 | 2,032 | 1,914 | 1,691 | 1,541 | 1,402 | -7.4% | -9.0% |
| Living Arrangement - Family Home | 453 | 365 | 306 | 322 | 236 | 197 | -14.9% | -17.4% |
| Total | 6,397 | 5,765 | 5,286 | 4,548 | 4,024 | 3,514 | -11.3% | -12.7% |

Table 32




| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Independent Living Programs | 229 | 205 | 197 | 212 | 188 | 161 | -6.5% | -14.4% |
| Residential Child Care Program | 1,016 | 886 | 859 | 708 | 611 | 557 | -12.3% | -14% |
| Community Supported Living Arrangement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Living Arrangement - Community-Based | 76 | 79 | 60 | 58 | 43 | 35 | -13.6% | -18.6% |
| Total | 1,321 | 1,170 | 1,116 | 978 | 842 | 753 | -11.4% | -14.6% |

Table 32



| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | 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-Residential Treatment Center | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Residential Educational Facilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Residential Treatment Centers | 239 | 184 | 193 | 183 | 183 | 179 | -5.1% | -2.2% |
| Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based | 100 | 122 | 106 | 96 | 89 | 71 | -5.6% | -20.2% |
| Total | 339 | 306 | 299 | 279 | 272 | 250 | -5.9% | -8.1% |


Table 33



| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| In-Patient Private | 6 | 16 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 35.8% | 11.1% |
| Psychiatric Hospitalization | 25 | 27 | 13 | 25 | 16 | 10 | -5.0% | -37.5% |
| Total | 31 | 43 | 18 | 31 | 25 | 20 | 2.7% | -20.0% |


Table 34

Human Resources Addendum Subcategory Demographic Totals Age




| Human Resources Family Home Settings | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Age | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| 0 through 5 | 1,892 | 1,622 | 1,589 | 1,461 | 1,324 | 1,209 | -8.5% | -8.7% |
| 6 through 11 | 1,386 | 1,166 | 984 | 871 | 816 | 760 | -11.2% | -6.9% |
| 12 through 17 | 2,140 | 1,960 | 1,744 | 1,377 | 1,239 | 1,050 | -13.2% | -15.3% |
| 18 and over | 979 | 1,017 | 969 | 839 | 645 | 495 | -12.1% | -23.3% |
| Total | 6,397 | 5,765 | 5,286 | 4,548 | 4,024 | 3,514 | -11.3% | -12.7% |

Table 35




| Human Resources Non-Community-Based Settings | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Age | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| 0 through 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| 6 through 11 | 17 | 21 | 27 | 17 | 17 | 13 | -1.7% | -23.5% |
| 12 through 17 | 250 | 193 | 192 | 186 | 176 | 174 | -6.6% | -1.1% |
| 18 and over | 72 | 92 | 80 | 76 | 79 | 63 | -1.3% | -20.3% |
| Total | 339 | 306 | 299 | 279 | 272 | 250 | -5.9% | -8.1% |

Table 37



| Human Resources Community-Based Settings | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Age | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| 0 through 5 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 53.7% | -100.0% |
| 6 through 11 | 71 | 34 | 36 | 36 | 31 | 20 | -19.1% | -35.5% |
| 12 through 17 | 610 | 510 | 475 | 401 | 322 | 319 | -11.9% | -0.9% |
| 18 and over | 636 | 625 | 599 | 536 | 486 | 414 | -8.1% | -14.8% |
| Total | 1,321 | 1,170 | 1,116 | 978 | 842 | 753 | -10.6% | -10.6% |


Table 36



| Human Resources Hospitalizations | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Age | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| 0 through 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 16.7% | 20.0% |
| 6 through 11 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| 12 through 17 | 16 | 24 | 4 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 28.3% | 0.0% |
| 18 and over | 4 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 92.3% | 66.7% |
| Total | 23 | 38 | 11 | 22 | 17 | 20 | 17.8% | 17.6% |


Table 38

Human Resources Addendum Subcategory Demographic Totals Gender




| Human Resources Family Home Settings | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Gender | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Male | 3,194 | 2,853 | 2,568 | 2,241 | 1,954 | 1,757 | -11.3% | -10.1% |
| Female | 3,203 | 2,911 | 2,717 | 2,307 | 2,068 | 1,755 | -11.3% | -15.1% |
| Unknown | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | NA | 0.0% |
| Total | 6,397 | 5,765 | 5,286 | 4,548 | 4,024 | 3,514 | -11.3% | -12.7% |

Table 39




| Human Resources Non-Community-Based Settings | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Gender | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Male | 204 | 204 | 188 | 180 | 174 | 166 | -3.9% | -3.3% |
| Female | 135 | 102 | 111 | 99 | 98 | 84 | -6.9% | -1.0% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 339 | 306 | 299 | 279 | 272 | 250 | -5.3% | -2.5% |

Table 41



| Human Resources Community-Based Settings | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Gender | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Male | 779 | 702 | 647 | 543 | 477 | 393 | -12.7% | -17.6% |
| Female | 542 | 468 | 469 | 435 | 365 | 360 | -7.6% | -1.4% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 1,321 | 1,170 | 1,117 | 978 | 842 | 753 | -10.6% | -10.6% |


Table 40



| Human Resources Hospitalization Settings | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Gender | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Male | 8 | 23 | 7 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 33.5% | -23.1% |
| Female | 15 | 15 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 10 | 42.0% | 150.0% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 23 | 38 | 11 | 22 | 17 | 20 | 17.8% | 17.6% |


Table 42

Human Resources Addendum Subcategory Demographic Totals Race




| Human Resources Family Home Settings | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Race | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| American Indian / Alaskan | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 27.3% | 100.0% |
| Asian | 12 | 14 | 13 | 11 | 14 | 9 | -2.9% | -35.7% |
| Black or African American | 4,588 | 3,931 | 3,479 | 2,866 | 2,466 | 2,058 | -14.8% | -16.5% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 30.0% | 0.0% |
| White | 1,356 | 1,384 | 1,403 | 1,300 | 1,155 | 1,052 | -4.8% | -8.9% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 250 | 227 | 212 | 188 | 188 | 205 | -3.6% | 9.0% |
| Other | 113 | 120 | 112 | 86 | 82 | 77 | -6.9% | -6.1% |
| Unknown | 71 | 86 | 63 | 93 | 114 | 106 | 11.5% | -7.0% |
| Total | 6,397 | 5,765 | 5,286 | 4,548 | 4,024 | 3,514 | -11.3% | -12.7% |

Table 43




| Human Resources Community-Based Settings | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Race | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| American Indian / Alaskan | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | NA | -100.0% |
| Asian | 8 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 4 | -19.7% | -20.0% |
| Black or African American | 915 | 841 | 766 | 676 | 575 | 487 | -28.7% | -15.3% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| White | 318 | 267 | 284 | 248 | 222 | 219 | -26.6% | -1.4% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 33 | 26 | 35 | 32 | 23 | 29 | -24.7% | 26.1% |
| Other | 17 | 11 | 17 | 12 | 11 | 8 | -23.7% | -27.3% |
| Unknown | 27 | 13 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 6 | -45.8% | 20.0% |
| Total | 1,321 | 1,170 | 1,116 | 978 | 842 | 753 | -28.5% | -10.6% |

Table 44



| Human Resources Non-Community-Based Settings | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Race | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| American Indian / Alaskan | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Asian | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | NA | 100.0% |
| Black or African American | 217 | 213 | 200 | 187 | 179 | 162 | -2.3% | -9.5% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| White | 107 | 74 | 81 | 75 | 74 | 68 | -4.4% | -8.1% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 13 | 10 | 14 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 9.1% | -18.2% |
| Other | 0 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 7 | NA | 40.0% |
| Unknown | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | NA | -100.0% |
| Total | 339 | 306 | 299 | 279 | 272 | 250 | -2.8% | -8.1% |

Table 45




| Human Resources Hospitalizations | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Race | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| American Indian / Alaskan | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Asian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Black or African American | 12 | 15 | 5 | 14 | 10 | 9 | 20.0% | -10.0% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| White | 7 | 15 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 22.0% | 40.0% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | NA | 0.0% |
| Other | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | NA | NA |
| Unknown | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | NA | NA |
| Total | 23 | 38 | 11 | 22 | 17 | 20 | 17.8% | 17.6% |

Table 46

Human Resources Addendum


Subcategory Out-of-State One-Day Census Trends

Placement Trends




| Human Resources Out-of-State Family Home Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | 1/31/ 2010 | 1/31/ 2011 | 1/31/ 2012 | 1/31/ 2013 | 1/31/ 2014 | 1/31/ 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Adoptive Care | 10 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 16.4% | 100.0% |
| Foster Care | 83 | 53 | 34 | 24 | 23 | 27 | -15.9% | 26.1% |
| Formal Relative (Kinship) Care | 22 | 26 | 23 | 27 | 21 | 23 | 2.3% | 9.5% |
| Restrictive Relative (Kinship) Care | 63 | 44 | 25 | 19 | 11 | 16 | -18.8% | 45.5% |
| Treatment Foster Care | 9 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | -40.0% | -100.0% |
| Living Arrangement - Family Home | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 14 | 8 | NA | -57.1% |
| All Categories | 187 | 141 | 97 | 89 | 73 | 78 | -15.0% | 6.8% |

Table 47



| Human Resources Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | 1/31/ 2010 | 1/31/ 2011 | 1/31/ 2012 | 1/31/ 2013 | 1/31/ 2014 | 1/31/ 2015 | 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 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 21 | 3.3% | 90.9% |
| Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 1.0% | 250.0% |
| All Categories | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 28 | NA | 115.4% |

Table 49




| Human Resources Out-of-State Community-Based Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | 1/31/ 2010 | 1/31/ 2011 | 1/31/ 2012 | 1/31/ 2013 | 1/31/ 2014 | 1/31/ 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Independent Living Programs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Residential Child Care Program | 47 | 44 | 38 | 42 | 45 | 43 | -1.4% | -4.4% |
| Community Supported Living Arrangement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Living Arrangement - Community-Based | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 7 | 4 | 184.2% | -42.9% |
| Total | 48 | 45 | 39 | 54 | 52 | 47 | 1.1% | -9.6% |

Table 48


Human Resources Addendum Subcategory Out-of-State Demographic Comparisons

Age



| Human Resources Out-of-State Family Home Age Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Age | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| 0 through 5 | 68 | 44 | 28 | 29 | 36 | 27 | -13.8% | -25.0% |
| 6 through 11 | 42 | 29 | 22 | 24 | 9 | 15 | -8.4% | 66.7% |
| 12 through 17 | 64 | 56 | 37 | 23 | 14 | 26 | -7.5% | 85.7% |
| 18 and over | 13 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 14 | 10 | -3.0% | -28.6% |
| Total | 187 | 141 | 97 | 89 | 73 | 78 | -15.0% | 6.8% |


Table 50



| Human Resources Out-of-State Community-Based Age Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Age | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| 0 through 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| 6 through 11 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | NA | -100.0% |
| 12 through 17 | 18 | 23 | 18 | 22 | 20 | 21 | 4.8% | 5.0% |
| 18 and over | 30 | 21 | 20 | 30 | 31 | 26 | 0.5% | -16.1% |
| Total | 48 | 45 | 39 | 54 | 52 | 47 | 1.1% | -9.6% |


Table 51

Gender



| Human Resources Out-of-State Family Home Gender Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Gender | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Male | 95 | 70 | 46 | 40 | 35 | 42 | -13.2% | 20.0% |
| Female | 92 | 71 | 51 | 49 | 38 | 36 | -16.5% | -5.3% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 187 | 141 | 97 | 89 | 73 | 78 | -15.0% | 6.8% |

Table 52





| Human Resources Out-of-State Community-Based Gender Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Gender | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Male | 28 | 29 | 25 | 30 | 32 | 29 | 1.4% | -9.4% |
| Female | 20 | 16 | 14 | 24 | 20 | 18 | 2.5% | -10.0% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 48 | 45 | 39 | 54 | 52 | 47 | 1.1% | -9.6% |

Table 53

Human Resources Addendum

Subcategory Out-of-State Demographic Comparisons

Race




| Human Resources Out-of-State Family Home Race Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Race | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| American Indian / Alaskan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Asian | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Black or African American | 119 | 92 | 63 | 54 | 35 | 34 | NA | -2.9% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| White | 58 | 40 | 28 | 30 | 27 | 30 | -32.8% | 11.1% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 7 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | -25.0% | 33.3% |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 8 | NA | 33.3% |
| Unknown | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | NA | 0.0% |
| Total | 187 | 141 | 97 | 89 | 73 | 78 | -32.3% | 6.8% |

Table 54

| Human Resources Out-of-State Community-Based Race Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Race | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| American Indian / Alaskan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Asian | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Black or African American | 24 | 26 | 21 | 31 | 29 | 24 | 2.6% | -17.2% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| White | 21 | 17 | 16 | 19 | 19 | 21 | 0.9% | 10.5% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | NA | -50.0% |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Unknown | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 48 | 45 | 39 | 54 | 52 | 47 | 1.1% | -9.6% |


Table 55

Human Resources Addendum Subcategory Cost Comparisons Total Costs and Per Bed-Day




| Human Resources Family Home Total Costs | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|
| FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| \$148,811,233 | \$131,576,951 | \$125,716,002 | \$117,085,829 | \$116,053,950 | \$102,218,445 | -7.1% | -11.9% |

Table 56




| Human Resources Community-Based Total Costs | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| \$115,833,310 | \$93,862,099 | \$89,645,537 | \$82,856,211 | \$78,813,615 | \$66,864,956 | -9.0% | -4.9% |

Table 58



| Human Resources Family Home Costs Per Bed-Day (Residential Only) | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------------|------------------|
| FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| \$90 | \$100 | \$98 | \$107 | \$111 | \$105 | 3.3% | -5.4% |

Table 57



| Human Resources Community-Based Costs Per Bed-Day (Residential Only) | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------------|------------------|
| FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| \$337 | \$283 | \$245 | \$264 | \$278 | \$265 | -4.1% | 5.4% |

Table 59

Department of Juvenile Services Summary

The Department of Juvenile Services' primary function is to appropriately manage, supervise, and treat youth who are involved in the juvenile justice system in Maryland. Juvenile Services provides individualized care and treatment to youth under the age of eighteen who violate criminal law, or are likely to violate the law, or whose behavior is such that they may endanger themselves or others. Objective screening and assessment tools are utilized to manage youth with the guidance of the data collected, and Juvenile Services works with partners in the community to achieve meaningful improvements to the outcomes of the youth they serve.

Key focus areas related to out-of-home placement in recent years include:

- **Pending Placement:** 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.
- **Risk and Needs Assessment:** Assessing youth at Intake and at Adjudication using objective assessment tools to ensure that decisions and strategies are guided by risk and needs. 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.
- **Placement Decision Process:** Restructuring the placement decision process for youth at risk of out-of-home placement. The Multi-Disciplinary Assessment Staffing Team process – an enriched multi-disciplinary process, intended to develop comprehensive individualized plans for youth who are removed from the 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.
- **Placement Review:** Reducing the number of youth ejected to detention from a committed program, and ensuring that such youth are quickly placed into a new program. Statutory changes passed during the 2011 legislative session give Juvenile Services 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 now allows Juvenile Services (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.
- **Accountability Incentives:** Implementing a system of graduated responses to reduce the number of youth committed for violating probation orders. The Accountability Incentives


Management system gives structured guidance to case managers to respond to behaviors that would otherwise possibly lead to a violation and commitment. This initiative rolled-out Statewide in July 2015.

- **Evidence Based Services:** Maintaining evidence-based in-home programming 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, these 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, Juvenile Services' 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 and served at home.
- **Placement Capacity:** Increased capacity for non-community-based residential programs for higher-risk youth. Juvenile Services has in recent years increased capacity to serve higher-risk youth that 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 more secure placements are now available at the State-run Victor Cullen Center and Schaefer House programs, and the private Silver Oak Academy program. 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 youth that were placed into non-secure programs, only to be ejected back to detention from programs that were not equipped to manage behavior.
- **Improved Administrative Process:** 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 out-of-State were previously required to be reviewed by the State Coordinating Council. In recent years, the Council has reevaluated and restructured the way it reviews the information on out-of-State placements. Individual reviews, seen as duplicative of the work being done at the local and State-agency levels have been discontinued. The referral form has also been streamlined to ensure that the Council notification process does not interfere with placing a youth into the most appropriate placement possible based on individual needs. Juvenile Services developed a checklist and tip-sheet for Juvenile Services 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.

2015 Data Highlights

Maryland has seen a sharp decline in the number of juvenile cases referred to Juvenile Services Intake in recent years. Since FY2010, the number of complaints referred to Juvenile Services


declined 42%. This reduction in cases coming to the Juvenile Services “front door” has slowly rippled through the system in recent years. Detention populations have begun to decline, and are down 47% since FY2010. Cases supervised in the community by Juvenile Services caseworkers have declined, with probation orders down 38% since FY2010. This declining trend is now also reflected in the committed out-of-home population. Table 60 shows a five-year decline of 27% in end of Fiscal Year population.



| Category | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Community-Based Residential Placement | 268 | 237 | 254 | 254 | 258 | 175 | -8.7% | -32.2% |
| Family Home Settings | 93 | 75 | 73 | 71 | 90 | 80 | -2.3% | -11.1% |
| Hospitalization | 8 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 5 | -4.4% | -37.5% |
| Non-Community Based Residential Placement | 562 | 630 | 623 | 614 | 525 | 415 | -6.5% | -21.0% |
| Placement Category Not Available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| All Categories | 931 | 947 | 957 | 948 | 881 | 675 | -7.2% | -23.4% |

Table 60

At the end of FY2015, Juvenile Services had 675 youth in out-of-home committed placement, which is the lowest committed population in decades. Declines have come in all categories of Juvenile Services placement, with the greatest declines in community-based residential.



| Category | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | Average Change |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------|
| Community-Based Residential Placement | 783 | 692 | 688 | 694 | 631 | 504 | -8.10% |
| Family Home | 210 | 208 | 173 | 184 | 206 | 157 | -4.70% |
| Non-Community-Based Residential Placement | 1,922 | 1,883 | 2,070 | 2,005 | 1,592 | 1,488 | -4.50% |
| Hospitalization | 70 | 84 | 74 | 96 | 88 | 84 | 2.30% |
| Not Available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA |
| Total | 2,985 | 2,867 | 3,005 | 2,979 | 2,517 | 2,233 | -5.40% |

Table 61

Juvenile Services Placement Trends

| Juvenile Services 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 |
| 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 |
| 2015 | 826 | 1,407 | 2,233 | 1,587 | 646 |
| Three-Year Change | -23% | -35.8% | -25.7% | -27.3% | -41% |
| Average Yearly Change | 0.2% | -7% | -2.4% | -2.8% | -9.1% |
| Recent Year Change | -18.6% | -23.1% | -11.3% | -16.6% | -22.9% |

Table 62

Juvenile Services saw the greatest decline in community-based programs, a 34.7% drop since FY2010. These programs are primarily group homes and therapeutic group homes (“Residential Child Care”). Family Home Setting programs (which are primarily Treatment Foster Care programs) saw a relatively modest decline of 14% since 2010. For non-community-based placements, the most significant drop was in Residential Treatment Center placements, which dropped 32.7% since 2010.

| Placement Type | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Five-Year Change | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Total In- and Out-of-State | 931 | 947 | 957 | 948 | 881 | 675 | -27.5% | -5.7% | -23.4% |
| Family Home Settings | 93 | 75 | 73 | 71 | 90 | 80 | -14.0% | -1.8% | -11.1% |
| Foster Care | 7 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 5 | -28.6% | -5.2% | 25.0% |
| Treatment Foster Care | 86 | 68 | 67 | 66 | 86 | 75 | -12.8% | -1.3% | -12.8% |
| Community-Based | 268 | 237 | 254 | 254 | 234 | 175 | -34.7% | -7.5% | -25.2% |
| Independent Living | 20 | 20 | 16 | 18 | 13 | 13 | -35.0% | -7.1% | 0.0% |
| Residential Child Care | 248 | 217 | 238 | 236 | 221 | 162 | -34.7% | -7.3% | -26.7% |
| Hospitalization | 8 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 5 | -37.5% | -3.5% | -37.5% |
| Non-Community-Based | 562 | 630 | 623 | 614 | 549 | 415 | -26.2% | -5.1% | -24.4% |
| Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment | 12 | 15 | 14 | 25 | 24 | 6 | -50.0% | 3.6% | -75.0% |
| Juvenile Commitment Centers | 180 | 178 | 167 | 185 | 159 | 125 | -30.6% | -6.4% | -21.4% |
| Non-Secure/Non-Residential Treatment Center | 21 | 23 | 38 | 39 | 41 | 27 | 28.6% | 9.7% | -34.1% |
| Residential Treatment Centers | 156 | 180 | 155 | 153 | 141 | 105 | -32.7% | -6.6% | -25.5% |
| Substance Abuse and Addiction | 192 | 234 | 249 | 212 | 184 | 162 | -15.6% | -2.3% | -12.0% |

Juvenile Services Table A

Demographics

Declines in the Juvenile Services out-of-home committed population have not been evenly spread across gender and races. While the male population declined 29.9% since 2010, the female population declined just 13.2%, with even a slight increase in Family Home Settings. While the White and African American populations both declined about 28% since 2010, the declines in the White population were mainly in non-community based (more secure) placements, while declines in the African American population were more in community-based (less-secure) placements.

| Demographics | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Five-Year Change | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Male | 787 | 821 | 814 | 793 | 735 | 552 | -29.9% | -6.3% | -24.9% |
| Family Home Settings | 68 | 57 | 52 | 54 | 62 | 50 | -26.5% | -5.1% | -19.4% |
| Community-Based | 213 | 189 | 197 | 194 | 183 | 137 | -35.7% | -7.9% | -25.1% |
| Non-Community-Based | 506 | 575 | 565 | 545 | 490 | 365 | -27.9% | -5.4% | -25.5% |
| Female | 136 | 121 | 136 | 146 | 138 | 118 | -13.2% | -2.3% | -14.5% |
| Family Home Settings | 25 | 18 | 21 | 17 | 28 | 30 | 20.0% | 8.3% | 7.1% |
| Community-Based | 55 | 48 | 57 | 60 | 51 | 38 | -30.9% | -5.8% | -25.5% |
| Non-Community-Based | 56 | 55 | 58 | 69 | 59 | 50 | -10.7% | -1.4% | -15.3% |
| Black or African American | 665 | 685 | 678 | 655 | 621 | 474 | -28.7% | -6.1% | -23.7% |
| Family Home Settings | 62 | 47 | 43 | 37 | 57 | 57 | -8.1% | 1.5% | 0.0% |
| Community-Based | 205 | 182 | 185 | 168 | 165 | 115 | -43.9% | -10.2% | -30.3% |
| Non-Community-Based | 398 | 456 | 450 | 450 | 399 | 302 | -24.1% | -4.5% | -24.3% |
| White | 211 | 208 | 236 | 228 | 195 | 152 | -28.0% | -5.6% | -22.1% |
| Family Home Settings | 25 | 23 | 25 | 31 | 29 | 19 | -24.0% | -3.2% | -34.5% |
| Community-Based | 54 | 42 | 60 | 66 | 53 | 49 | -9.3% | 0.7% | -7.5% |
| Non-Community-Based | 132 | 143 | 151 | 131 | 113 | 84 | -36.4% | -7.7% | -25.7% |
| Other | 47 | 49 | 36 | 56 | 48 | 44 | -6.4% | 2.1% | -8.3% |
| Family Home Settings | 6 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | -33.3% | -4.7% | 0.0% |
| Community-Based | 9 | 13 | 9 | 20 | 16 | 11 | 22.2% | 16.9% | -31.3% |
| Non-Community-Based | 32 | 31 | 22 | 33 | 28 | 29 | -9.4% | 1.3% | 3.6% |

Juvenile Services Table B

Juvenile Services Out-of-State Placements

Juvenile Services policy states that youth may not be placed out-of-State without the approval of the Secretary or designee. Juvenile Services adheres to Interstate Compact requirements and agreements with other states regarding requests for permission and notifications when youth are placed in another state. Maryland Law includes specific criteria for out-of-State placement including the condition that a youth's individualized needs cannot be met through in-State resources. Youth placed in out-of-State facilities are visited by Juvenile Services staff at least quarterly and parents/guardians are provided with opportunities to visit youth at least once per quarter.

In general, out-of-State placement is driven by a lack of sufficient hardware-secure beds for males, and lack of staff-secure beds for females. If youth are going to kinship care out-of-State, they go through Interstate Compact for Juveniles and are not placed there by Juvenile Services. The following is a list of factors that might contribute to a Juvenile Services out-of-State placement:

Males:

- Age 18 or older and in need of Residential Treatment Center placement
- Too aggressive (assaultive behavior while in in-State placement)
- In need of Residential Treatment Center placement and already have diploma or GED
- Need hardware-secure placement and offense is excluded by Victor Cullen Center criteria, including those males placed in out-of-State staff-secure who would need hardware-secure placement if placed in-State due to risk levels
- In need of hardware-secure Residential Treatment Center placement because of mental health treatment needs and behavioral problems including aggression
- Separation of youth who need staff- or hardware-secure placement so that they are in different facilities
- Arsonist, sex offender in need of non-Residential Treatment Center staff-secure program

Females:


- History of runaway from community-based residential placement and/or ejections from community-based residential placement and re-offending
- In need of staff-secure long-term substance abuse treatment and/or mental health treatment or diagnosed with co-occurring disorders and have behavioral issues as well (including aggression)
- In need of Residential Treatment Center placement and already have diploma or GED

A review of current out of state Juvenile Services cases, conducted by Resource staff in November 2015, showed the following reasons for out-of-State placement:

| | Nature of Offense | Multiple Ejections | IQ/ Aggression | Age | Education Needs | Long-term Substance Abuse Treatment Needed | Need Female Staff-Secure Program |
|--------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------|-----------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Male | 26 | 23 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Female | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 27 | 23 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |

Juvenile Services Table C

In terms of population trends, Juvenile Services saw a significant decline in all categories in the most recent year, after a peak in 2012. Most significant was a sharp drop in out-of-State Residential Treatment Center and Substance Abuse and Addiction placements.



| Department of Juvenile Services Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Placement Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Non-Secure/Non-Residential Treatment | 19 | 28 | 38 | 30 | 30 | 27 | 10.4% | -10.0% |
| Residential Educational Facilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Residential Treatment Centers | 21 | 23 | 18 | 26 | 21 | 11 | -6.9% | -47.6% |
| Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs | 53 | 68 | 76 | 67 | 45 | 46 | -0.5% | 2.2% |
| Living Arrangement - Non-Community Based | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |

Jurisdiction


The largest number of Juvenile Services placements (22.2%) involve Prince George's County residents, followed by Baltimore City (16.7%). Out-of-State residents placed in Maryland Juvenile Services facilities make up 2.7% of all Juvenile Services placements.

| Juvenile Services Placement By Jurisdiction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------|--------------|-----------|----------------|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|------------|-----------|---------|---------|--------|------|------------|-----------------|--------------|----------|------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------|--------------|---------|---|
| Home Jurisdiction of Children | Jurisdiction Where Children Were Placed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | # children from jurisdiction in placement | % of children Statewide in placements from jurisdiction | Allegany | Anne Arundel | Baltimore | Baltimore City | Calvert | Caroline | Carroll | Cecil | Charles | Dorchester | Frederick | Garrett | Harford | Howard | Kent | Montgomery | Prince George's | Queen Anne's | Somerset | St. Mary's | Talbot | Washington | Wicomico | Worcester | Out-of-State | Unknown | |
| Allegany | 11 | 1.6% | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Anne Arundel | 60 | 8.9% | 11 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 0 | |
| Baltimore | 39 | 5.8% | 4 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | |
| Baltimore City | 113 | 16.7% | 7 | 1 | 13 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 0 | |
| Calvert | 4 | 0.6% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Caroline | 4 | 0.6% | 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 | |
| Carroll | 14 | 2.1% | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Cecil | 11 | 1.6% | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Charles | 24 | 3.6% | 3 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Dorchester | 7 | 1.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Frederick | 28 | 4.1% | 7 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Garrett | 5 | 0.7% | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Harford | 17 | 2.5% | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Howard | 13 | 1.9% | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Kent | 4 | 0.6% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Montgomery | 42 | 6.2% | 4 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | |
| Prince George's | 150 | 22.2% | 19 | 2 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 34 | 0 | |
| Queen Anne's | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Somerset | 7 | 1.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| St. Mary's | 19 | 2.8% | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Talbot | 6 | 0.9% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Washington | 26 | 3.9% | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Wicomico | 45 | 6.7% | 1 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 3 | 0 | |
| Worcester | 7 | 1.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Out-of-State | 18 | 2.7% | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 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 | 675 | 100.0% | 88 | 4 | 105 | 57 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 49 | 45 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 23 | 0 | 84 | 0 | |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 63.6% | 0.0% | 25.6% | 9.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 4.2% | 0.0% | 14.3% | 20.0% | 5.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 19.0% | 2.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 30.8% | 26.7% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 0.0% | |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 13.0% | 0.6% | 15.6% | 8.4% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 8.1% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.3% | 8.3% | 6.7% | 0.3% | 0.7% | 1.5% | 8.7% | 1.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.9% | 5.0% | 0.0% | 12.4% | 0.0% | | |

Table 63

Costs


Costs have gradually trended downward in most categories. The exception is non-community-based placements, which have risen in cost over the last five years by almost five percent. Out-of-State placements are a slight contributor to the overall increase, as out-of-State non-community-based costs have increased about 1.6% over the last five years.



| Juvenile Services Total Cost | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Category | FY2010 | FY2011 | FY2012 | FY2013 | FY2014 | FY2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Community-Based Residential Placement | \$24,592,016 | \$23,676,804 | \$21,634,051 | \$26,725,210 | \$21,828,389 | \$15,788,423 | -6.96% | -27.67% |
| Family Home Settings | \$5,717,155 | \$4,575,954 | \$4,517,994 | \$5,329,639 | \$6,278,370 | \$4,920,731 | -1.42% | -21.62% |
| Hospitalization | \$97,064 | \$28,977 | \$14,946 | \$41,220 | \$19,652 | \$0 | -19.02% | -100.00% |
| Non-Community-Based Residential Placement | \$45,458,947 | \$48,695,167 | \$59,475,243 | \$56,581,033 | \$64,467,134 | \$55,817,303 | 4.98% | -13.42% |
| Not Available | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | NA | NA |
| All Categories | \$75,865,182 | \$76,976,902 | \$85,642,234 | \$88,677,102 | \$92,593,545 | \$76,526,457 | 0.67% | -17.35% |

Table 64

Because the placements at psychiatric hospitals are not paid by Juvenile Services, the cost shown for Hospitalizations for FY2015 in Tables 64 and 65 is zero dollars. Juvenile Services pays for any education costs and Medical Assistance or private insurance pays for the residential costs. In past years, the hospitalization costs included the cost of placement in non-psychiatric hospitals and some residential costs where a placement was made in the middle of a month and therefore was not covered by Medical Assistance or private insurance.



| Juvenile Services Cost Per Bed Day | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|----------------|------------------|
| Category | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY2014 | FY2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Community-Based Residential Placement | \$225 | \$225 | \$233 | \$251 | \$235 | \$230 | 1.2% | -2.1% |
| Family Home Settings | \$177 | \$271 | \$184 | \$206 | \$231 | \$191 | 11.3% | -17.3% |
| Hospitalization | \$141 | \$99 | \$168 | \$118 | \$1 | \$0 | -22.3% | -100.0% |
| Non-Community-Based Residential Placement | \$349 | \$243 | \$329 | \$281 | \$281 | \$541 | -2.4% | 92.5% |
| Not Available | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | \$0 | NA | NA |
| All Categories | \$279 | \$239 | \$287 | \$266 | \$187 | \$192 | -7.8% | 2.7% |

Table 65

Juvenile Services Strategies


The Continuum of Care statute ensures that Juvenile Services has the ability to quickly move youth as necessary from committed placements that are not working out, without need for further court action. This permits Juvenile Services to leverage current resources and to strengthen the Juvenile Services Continuum of Care to best serve youth committed to Juvenile Services for treatment and rehabilitation by:

- Eliminating or reducing 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 they remain in pending placement for long periods of time.
- Decreasing the overall length of time the youth stays in committed status with Juvenile Services, by allowing Juvenile Services to swiftly address treatment concerns and issues without the youth being placed in detention.

The Continuum of Care legislation has had a significant impact on Juvenile Services operations. It has led to a sustained reduction of youth pending placement in detention centers and has improved the youth’s ability to promptly receive the required treatment services in the most appropriate setting.


Juvenile Services is participating on a subcommittee of the Interagency Rate Setting Committee 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.

Juvenile Services Addendum Subcategory One-Day Census Totals Placement Trends




| Juvenile Services Family Home Settings Placement Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Adoptive Care | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Foster Care | 7 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 5 | -5.2% | 25.0% |
| 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 | 86 | 68 | 67 | 66 | 86 | 75 | -1.3% | -12.8% |
| Living Arrangement - Family Home | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 93 | 75 | 73 | 71 | 90 | 80 | -1.8% | -11.1% |

Table 66



| Juvenile Services Community-Based Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Independent Living Programs | 20 | 20 | 16 | 18 | 13 | 13 | -7.1% | 0.0% |
| Residential Child Care Programs | 248 | 217 | 238 | 236 | 221 | 162 | -7.3% | -26.7% |
| Community Supported Living Arrangement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Living Arrangement - CB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 268 | 237 | 254 | 254 | 234 | 175 | -7.5% | -25.2% |


Table 67



| Juvenile Services Non-Community Placement Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program | 12 | 15 | 14 | 25 | 24 | 6 | 3.6% | -75.0% |
| Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers | 180 | 178 | 167 | 185 | 159 | 125 | -6.4% | -21.4% |
| Non-Secure/Non-Residential Treatment Center | 21 | 23 | 38 | 39 | 41 | 27 | 9.7% | -34.1% |
| Residential Educational Facilities | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Residential Treatment Centers | 156 | 180 | 155 | 153 | 141 | 105 | -6.6% | -25.5% |
| Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs (ASAM) | 192 | 234 | 249 | 212 | 184 | 152 | -2.3% | -12.0% |
| Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 562 | 630 | 623 | 614 | 549 | 415 | -4.7% | -22.6% |


Table 68

Juvenile Services Addendum Subcategory Totals Demographic Comparisons Age




| Juvenile Services Family Home Settings Age Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Age | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| 0 through 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| 6 through 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | NA | 100.0% |
| 12 through 17 | 60 | 42 | 33 | 34 | 46 | 40 | -5.2% | -13.0% |
| 18 and over | 33 | 33 | 40 | 36 | 43 | 40 | 4.7% | -7.0% |
| Total | 93 | 75 | 73 | 71 | 90 | 80 | -1.8% | -11.1% |

Table 69



| Juvenile Services Non-Community-Based Settings Age Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Age | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| 0 through 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| 6 through 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 26.7% | 0.0% |
| 12 through 17 | 428 | 466 | 488 | 482 | 435 | 328 | -4.4% | -24.6% |
| 18 and over | 133 | 163 | 134 | 129 | 113 | 86 | -7.1% | -23.9% |
| Total | 562 | 630 | 623 | 614 | 549 | 415 | -5.1% | -24.4% |


Table 71



| Juvenile Services Community-Based Settings Age Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Age | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | 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 | 211 | 174 | 196 | 195 | 162 | 121 | -7.5% | -25.3% |
| 18 and over | 57 | 63 | 58 | 59 | 72 | 54 | -2.3% | -25.0% |
| Total | 268 | 237 | 254 | 254 | 234 | 175 | -6.5% | -25.2% |


Table 70

Juvenile Services Addendum Subcategory Totals Demographic Comparisons Gender




| Juvenile Services Family Home Settings Gender Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Gender | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Male | 68 | 57 | 52 | 54 | 62 | 50 | -5.1% | -19.4% |
| Female | 25 | 18 | 21 | 17 | 28 | 30 | 8.3% | 7.1% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 93 | 75 | 73 | 71 | 90 | 80 | -1.8% | -11.1% |

Table 72



| Juvenile Services Non-Community-Based Gender Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Gender | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Male | 506 | 575 | 565 | 545 | 490 | 365 | -5.4% | -25.5% |
| Female | 56 | 55 | 58 | 69 | 59 | 50 | -1.4% | -15.3% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 562 | 630 | 623 | 614 | 549 | 415 | -5.1% | -24.4% |


Table 74



| Juvenile Services Community-Based Gender Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Gender | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Male | 213 | 189 | 197 | 194 | 183 | 137 | -7.9% | -25.1% |
| Female | 55 | 48 | 57 | 60 | 51 | 38 | -5.8% | -25.5% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 268 | 237 | 254 | 254 | 234 | 175 | -7.5% | -7.9% |


Table 73

Juvenile Services Addendum Subcategory Totals Demographic Comparisons Race




| Juvenile Services Family Home Settings Race Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Race | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| American Indian / Alaskan | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Asian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Black or African American | 62 | 47 | 43 | 37 | 57 | 57 | 1.5% | 0.0% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| White | 25 | 23 | 25 | 31 | 29 | 19 | -3.2% | -34.5% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Other | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | -2.3% | -25.0% |
| Unknown | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | NA | NA |
| Total | 93 | 75 | 73 | 71 | 90 | 80 | -1.8% | -11.1% |

Table 75



| Juvenile Services Non-Community Based Settings Race Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Race | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| American Indian / Alaskan | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Asian | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | NA | 0.0% |
| Black or African American | 398 | 456 | 450 | 450 | 399 | 302 | -4.5% | -24.3% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| White | 132 | 143 | 151 | 131 | 113 | 84 | -7.7% | -25.7% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Other | 25 | 24 | 22 | 31 | 27 | 27 | 3.1% | 0.0% |
| Unknown | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | NA | NA |
| Total | 562 | 630 | 623 | 614 | 540 | 415 | -5.1% | -23.1% |


Table 77



| Juvenile Services Community-Based Settings Race Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Race | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| American Indian / Alaskan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Asian | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | NA | -100.0% |
| Black or African American | 205 | 182 | 185 | 168 | 165 | 115 | -10.2% | -30.3% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| White | 54 | 42 | 60 | 66 | 53 | 49 | 0.7% | -7.5% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Other | 7 | 11 | 9 | 18 | 15 | 11 | 19.1% | -26.7% |
| Unknown | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 268 | 237 | 254 | 254 | 234 | 175 | -7.5% | -25.2% |

Table 76

Juvenile Services Addendum Subcategory Out-of-State One-Day Census Totals




| Juvenile Services Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Placement Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Non-Secure/Non- Residential Treatment Center | 19 | 28 | 38 | 30 | 30 | 27 | 10.4% | -10.0% |
| Residential Educational Facilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Residential Treatment Centers | 21 | 23 | 18 | 26 | 21 | 11 | -6.9% | -47.6% |
| Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs | 53 | 68 | 76 | 67 | 45 | 46 | -0.5% | 2.2% |
| Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 95 | 124 | 132 | 123 | 96 | 84 | -0.9% | -12.5% |

Table 78

Juvenile Services Addendum Subcategory Out-of-State Demographic Comparison


Age



| Juvenile Services Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Age Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Age | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | 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 | 59 | 79 | 88 | 79 | 62 | 61 | 2.4% | -1.6% |
| 18 and over | 36 | 45 | 44 | 44 | 34 | 23 | -6.5% | -32.4% |
| Total | 95 | 124 | 132 | 123 | 96 | 84 | -0.9% | -12.5% |

Table 79


Race



| Juvenile Services Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Race Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Race | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| American Indian / Alaskan | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Asian | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Black or African American | 78 | 104 | 119 | 107 | 87 | 72 | 0.3% | -17.2% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| White | 12 | 12 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 7 | -6.3% | 16.7% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Other | 4 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 14.0% | 66.7% |
| Unknown | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 95 | 124 | 132 | 123 | 96 | 84 | -0.9% | -12.5% |

Table 81


Gender



| Juvenile Services Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Gender Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Gender | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Male | 89 | 123 | 130 | 117 | 87 | 77 | -0.6% | -11.5% |
| Female | 6 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 48.9% | -22.2% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 95 | 124 | 132 | 123 | 96 | 84 | -0.9% | -12.5% |


Table 80

Juvenile Services Addendum Subcategory Cost Comparison Total Costs




| Subcategory | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|------------------|
| Foster Care | \$108,702 | \$94,347 | \$85,937 | \$83,656 | \$55,821 | \$51,562 | -13.1% | -7.6% |
| Treatment Foster Care | \$5,608,453 | \$4,481,607 | \$4,432,057 | \$5,245,983 | \$6,082,517 | \$4,871,104 | -1.4% | -19.9% |
| Total | \$5,717,155 | \$4,575,954 | \$4,517,994 | \$5,329,639 | \$6,138,338 | \$4,922,666 | -1.6% | -19.8% |

Table 82



| Subcategory | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program | \$469,239 | \$772,896 | \$539,495 | \$1,303,799 | \$1,167,096 | \$1,987,618 | 47.2% | 70.3% |
| Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers | \$24,558,746 | \$25,367,344 | \$27,630,982 | \$26,831,507 | \$31,578,635 | \$34,333,191 | 7.1% | 8.7% |
| Non-Secure/Non-RTC | \$4,742,328 | \$5,919,055 | \$7,787,834 | \$9,910,700 | \$4,472,218 | \$3,894,028 | 3.2% | -12.9% |
| Residential Educational Facilities | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | NA | NA |
| Residential Treatment Centers | \$9,913,715 | \$10,433,639 | \$9,344,675 | \$10,814,084 | \$2,626,588 | \$5,196,056 | 6.5% | 97.8% |
| Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs | \$5,774,919 | \$6,202,233 | \$14,172,257 | \$7,720,944 | \$5,526,535 | \$16,743,059 | 53.0% | 203.0% |
| Total | \$45,458,947 | \$48,695,167 | \$59,475,243 | \$56,581,033 | \$45,371,072 | \$62,153,951 | 8.3% | 37.0% |

Table 84



| Subcategory | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Independent Living Programs | \$1,423,270 | \$2,879,310 | \$2,197,844 | \$1,314,246 | \$1,187,123 | \$916,807 | 1.2% | -22.8% |
| Residential Child Care Programs | \$23,168,746 | \$20,797,494 | \$19,436,207 | \$25,410,964 | \$19,687,564 | \$14,877,918 | -6.6% | -24.4% |
| Community Supported Living Arrangement | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | NA | NA |
| Living Arrangement - Community-Based | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | NA | NA |
| Total | \$24,592,016 | \$23,676,804 | \$21,634,051 | \$26,725,210 | \$20,874,687 | \$15,794,725 | -7.0% | -24.3% |

Table 83

Juvenile Services Addendum Subcategory Cost Comparison Per Bed-Day




Table 85




Table 86




Table 87

Juvenile Services Addendum Subcategory Out-of-State Cost Comparison




Table 88




Table 89

Developmental Disabilities Administration Summary

The Developmental Disabilities Administration provides a coordinated service delivery system so that people diagnosed with intellectual and developmental disabilities receive appropriate services oriented toward the goal of integration in the community. The Developmental Disabilities Administration currently serves approximately 25,000 individuals who are supported through a wide array of community-based services delivered primarily through a network of licensed providers. The service delivery systems include home and community-based services and supports provided through either a Medicaid State Plan or Waiver program or via State-funded services.

Individuals across the lifespan must apply and be determined eligible for Developmental Disabilities Administration services in order to receive funding. The Developmental Disabilities Administration makes services available to children and adults both in their family homes, their own homes, and in out-of-home placements. The Developmental Disabilities Administration focuses on people receiving services in the most integrated settings so that they can remain involved with family and support networks.

When children reside in out-of-home placements, they should receive all appropriate entitlement services prior to accessing Developmental Disabilities Administration funds for services. Although the Developmental Disabilities Administration licenses community-based service providers to provide services to children, it does not fund services to most of the children in out-of-home placements as those services can be funded through entitlement services through Human Resources and Education.

According to Table 91, in FY2015, the Developmental Disabilities Administration provided funding for out-of-home services to a total of 123 children, a decrease of 4.5% from FY2014. This is somewhat of a misnomer as the Community Supported Living Arrangement is usually provided in the family home but the Developmental Disabilities Administration does not currently have the ability to easily track which Community Supported Living Arrangement services are provided in a family home. Community Supported Living Arrangement services are often used to supplement other funded services. For example, a child in a residential school placement who goes home on holidays may need support during the time that they are home.


The Developmental Disabilities Administration considers families and caregivers to be the primary supports for children diagnosed with intellectual and developmental disabilities, and believes they should have an integral role in their children's care. The Developmental Disabilities Administration 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.

Residential services are provided by the Developmental Disabilities Administration licensed providers, and include Group Homes and Alternative Living Units. Group Homes are residences owned, leased, or operated by a Developmental Disabilities Administration licensee that

provide specialized residential services to at least four but not more than eight individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Alternative Living Units are residences owned or leased by the Developmental Disabilities Administration licensees that provide specialized residential services to no more than three individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

Table 90 indicates that the Developmental Disabilities Administration funded 19 individuals in residential child care programs in the past year. According to data, all of these individuals were in the age range of 19-21 years of age. Youth in this age range are considered adults in the Human Resources and Juvenile Services systems but the Developmental Disabilities Administration does not consider them adults until the age of 21. The Developmental Disabilities Administration funded youth in this age range in its adult programs with special exceptions to best meet the needs of the youth. Any youth identified as eligible and in need of a placement after the age of 18 is not served by Human Resources. Human Resources reaches out to the Developmental Disabilities Administration for funding and services for these individuals.

The Developmental Disabilities Administration 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, the Developmental Disabilities Administration collaborates with other agencies, such as Human Resources, Education, and the Behavioral Health Administration (of the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene). 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.



| Developmental Disabilities Placement Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Independent Living Programs | 12 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Residential Child Care Programs | 0 | 2 | 11 | 22 | 17 | 19 | NA | 11.8% |
| Community-Supported Living Arrangement | 117 | 96 | 84 | 81 | 68 | 62 | -11.8% | -8.8% |
| Living Arrangement – Community-Based | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 129 | 107 | 95 | 103 | 85 | 81 | -8.4% | -4.7% |

Table 90

2015 Data Highlights


The Maryland Developmental Disabilities Administration has initiated a joint effort Statewide to support families through the Community of Practice for Supporting Families. The Supporting Families project recognizes families as the most important group of people in our society, serving as a source of support for all its members.

For people diagnosed with intellectual and developmental disabilities the role of family is unique, and often key in the support and care provided across the lifespan. Family members play important roles in finding and providing opportunities for people diagnosed with a disability to participate within their community in meaningful ways and helping them access a self-determined life. Parents and other family members of people diagnosed with intellectual and developmental disabilities often provide medical, behavioral, financial, and other daily supports beyond what most families provide.

The Supporting Families project will guide families of individuals diagnosed with intellectual and developmental disabilities across the life span, covering all of the stages of life. It will provide families with the opportunity to discover information and navigate the system, connect and network with others, and access day-to-day services and supports.

The Developmental Disabilities Administration wants to ensure that families have access to person-centered and family-centered resources, supports, services, and other assistance. These strategies are directed to the family, but in the end, benefit the individual diagnosed with intellectual and developmental disabilities, across the lifespan.

As indicated in Table 92, the total number of placements at the start of each fiscal year has declined 50.7% over the past three years. The number of new placements in Developmental Disabilities Administration services from FY2014 to FY2015 decreased by 2.8%. The total number of out-of-home placements in FY2015 was 123, 3.9% lower than in FY2014. This table indicates 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.



| Development Disabilities Total Served | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|----------------|------------------|
| | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Family Home | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Community-Based | 169 | 152 | 173 | 150 | 128 | 123 | -5.6% | -3.9% |
| Total | 169 | 152 | 173 | 150 | 128 | 123 | -5.6% | -3.9% |

Table 91

Of the 81 children receiving Developmental Disabilities Administration funded services on January 31, 2015, all but one was placed in their home jurisdiction. Jurisdictions with larger percentages of children in out-of-home placement are consistent with the population of those jurisdictions as indicated in Table 93.


| Development Disabilities 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 |
| 2011 | 116 | 36 | 152 | 28 | 124 |
| 2012 | 102 | 71 | 173 | 34 | 139 |
| 2013 | 102 | 48 | 150 | 28 | 122 |
| 2014 | 92 | 36 | 128 | 27 | 101 |
| 2015 | 88 | 35 | 123 | 29 | 94 |
| Three-Year Change | -13.7% | -50.7% | -28.9% | -14.7% | -32.4% |
| Average Yearly Change | -6.6% | 9.3% | -4.5% | 1.9% | -6.1% |
| Recent Year Change | -4.3% | -2.8% | -3.9% | 7.4% | -6.9% |

Table 92

| Development Disabilities Placement by Jurisdiction on 1/31/2015 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------|--------------|-----------|----------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|------------|-----------|---------|---------|--------|--------|------------|-----------------|--------------|----------|------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------|--------------|----------|------|
| | | 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 | 1 | 4.10% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Anne Arundel | 1 | 2.70% | 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 |
| Baltimore | 5 | 11.00% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 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 | 8 | 4.10% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Calvert | 3 | 2.70% | 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 | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0 | 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 | 5 | 8.20% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Cecil | 1 | 0.00% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Charles | 1 | 2.70% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Dorchester | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0 | 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 | 1.40% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Garrett | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0 | 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 | 1.40% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Howard | 3 | 4.10% | 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 | 1 | 0.00% | 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 | 30 | 35.60% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Prince George's | 10 | 15.10% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Queen Anne | 0 | 0.00% | 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 | |
| Somerset | 1 | 1.40% | 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 | |
| St. Mary's | 1 | 1.40% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Talbot | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0 | 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 | 4.10% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Wicomico | 5 | 0.00% | 0 | 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 | |
| Worcester | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0.00% | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0.00% | 0 | 0 | 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 | 81 | 100.00% | 1 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 30 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 80.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 1.2% | 1.2% | 4.9% | 11.1% | 3.7% | 0.0% | 7.4% | 1.2% | 1.2% | 0.0% | 2.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3.7% | 1.2% | 37.0% | 12.3% | 0.0% | 1.2% | 1.2% | 0.0% | 3.7% | 6.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | |

Table 93


Costs



| Development Disabilities Total Cost | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | FY2010 | FY2011 | FY2012 | FY2013 | FY2014 | FY2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Residential Child Care Program | \$2,027,781 | \$1,848,389 | \$3,029,693 | \$2,908,846 | \$2,272,657 | \$2,779,521 | 10.3% | 22.3% |
| Community Supported Living Arrangement | \$3,307,332 | \$2,823,561 | \$2,843,317 | \$3,259,484 | \$2,823,561 | \$2,655,439 | -3.7% | -6.0% |
| Total | \$5,335,113 | \$4,671,950 | \$5,873,011 | \$6,168,330 | \$5,096,218 | \$5,434,960 | 1.5% | 6.6% |

Table 94

While the cost per bed-day for Residential Child Care Program services increased slightly in the past year, it is still more costly than providing services through Community Supported Living Arrangements. Over the past six years, there has been a slight increase in the cost of these services, but it still remains the more cost-effective model for providing services. The total costs of Developmental Disabilities Administration out-of-home placements have increased slightly over the past year. This is influenced by the increase in the cost per bed-day for Community Supported Living Arrangement services.



| Development Disabilities Cost Per Bed Day | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Residential Child Care Program | \$319 | \$324 | \$353 | \$321 | \$304 | \$306 | -0.7% | 0.6% |
| Community-Supported Living Arrangement | \$73 | \$72 | \$87 | \$95 | \$72 | \$100 | 8.8% | 38.5% |
| Total | \$103 | \$105 | \$142 | \$142 | \$188 | \$153 | 10.2% | -18.7% |

Table 95

Development Disabilities Strategies

The greatest challenge to the Developmental Disabilities Administration 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 State agency services. 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. The Developmental Disabilities Administration will continue to participate in efforts to improve communication and collaboration through interagency and intra-agency boards, coordinating councils, committee, and task forces at State and local levels to identify children earlier to allow for smoother transition to adult services.


The Developmental Disabilities Administration and the Department of Human Resources currently have a comprehensive memorandum of understanding in place that has enabled the Developmental Disabilities Administration to improve the planning process for youth transitioning out of the Human Resources system. Efforts are being made to enhance the training and guidance on the contents of the memorandum to ensure that Developmental Disabilities Administration and Human Resources staff are effective in implementing the planning process strategies.

The Developmental Disabilities Administration will continue to work with community resources and other State agencies to enable children to remain in their homes. The Developmental Disabilities Administration works in conjunction with other State and local agencies to assess the community's capacity to meet the ongoing needs of children diagnosed 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.

The Developmental Disabilities Administration will also continue to explore needs and the development of resources that will allow families to support their children diagnosed with disabilities in their homes. The Developmental Disabilities Administration remains committed to focusing on supporting families and will continue enhance its support of families through the Community of Practice for Supporting Families.

Development Disabilities Addendum Subcategory Totals Demographic Comparisons

Age




Development Disabilities Age Trends

| Age | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|---------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| 0 through 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| 6 through 11 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 9 | 8.7% | 50.0% |
| 12 through 17 | 53 | 43 | 37 | 30 | 28 | 21 | -16.7% | -25.0% |
| 18 and over | 66 | 58 | 52 | 63 | 51 | 51 | -4.1% | 0.0% |
| Total | 129 | 107 | 95 | 103 | 85 | 81 | -8.4% | -4.7% |

Table 96

Gender




Development Disabilities Gender Trends

| Gender | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|--------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Male | 82 | 65 | 62 | 67 | 54 | 51 | -8.4% | -5.6% |
| Female | 47 | 42 | 33 | 36 | 31 | 30 | -8.0% | -3.2% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 129 | 107 | 95 | 103 | 85 | 81 | -8.4% | -4.7% |

Table 97

Race




Development Disabilities Race Trends

| Race | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| American Indian / Alaskan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Asian | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 30.0% | 0.0% |
| Black or African American | 33 | 26 | 21 | 31 | 26 | 26 | -1.8% | 0.0% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| White | 32 | 26 | 28 | 35 | 31 | 34 | 2.4% | 9.7% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | NA | 0.0% |
| Other | 45 | 36 | 25 | 24 | 19 | 13 | -21.4% | -31.6% |
| Unknown | 18 | 18 | 19 | 9 | 4 | 3 | -25.5% | -25.0% |
| Total | 129 | 107 | 95 | 103 | 85 | 81 | -8.4% | -4.7% |

Table 98

Development Disabilities Addendum Subcategory Out-of-State One-Day Census Totals



| Development Disabilities Out-of-State Placements | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Living Arrangement - Community-Based | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |

Table 99

Behavioral Health Administration Summary


Effective July 1, 2014, within the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration merged with the Mental Hygiene Administration to form the Behavioral Health Administration. In past years, placement data from both administrations were considered separately. Beginning with this year's report, Behavioral Health will be considered as a single entity and all past data tables have been merged. Consider this context when viewing tables that include a "total" row or column.

As a result of the integration, effective January 2015, substance-related disorder services were carved-out of Maryland Medicaid's HealthChoice managed care program and administered along with mental health services by an Administrative Service Organization (Service Organization). Substance-related disorder service providers have selected services authorized and paid by the Service Organization, allowing for integrated behavioral health data. Although the two administrations merged in July 2014, the data collection for the two systems was not integrated until January 1, 2015. Substance-related disorder data that had been previously collected through the Strengthening Medicare and Repaying Taxpayers¹² system (System) is now collected through the Service Organization. At the time of this report, the first half of FY2015 substance-related disorder data was stored by the System, while the data for the second half of the fiscal year was collected by the Service Organization. Having the substance-related disorder data in two disparate data systems proved difficult and requires extra time to reconcile and merge into one coherent data set. As a result, the requested data are not currently available.

Behavioral Health will continue the process of validating the substance-related disorder data and preparing it for reporting purposes. Efforts are being made to have the data available to report in FY2016.

It is important to note the data for residential treatment centers includes all placements which are paid through Medicaid – a Health and Mental Hygiene program – regardless of which State agency actually arranges and has responsibility for the placement. Only a small number of children are placed in residential treatment centers by Behavioral Health through its local Core Service Agency offices. The vast majority of residential treatment center placements are arranged and monitored by Human Resources (through its Local Departments of Social Services) and Juvenile Services, whose youth receive Medicaid, and this funding is used for many placements.

¹² Strengthening Medicare and Repaying Taxpayers (SMART) Act, H.R. 1845, January 10, 2013.



| Behavioral Health Placement Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | 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-Residential Treatment Center | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Residential Educational Facilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Residential Treatment Centers | 482 | 440 | 371 | 393 | 418 | 385 | -4.0% | -7.9% |
| Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs | 208 | 204 | 180 | 175 | 175 | NA | -23.3% | NA |
| Living Arrangement - Non-Community-Based | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |

Table 100

Behavioral Health utilizes two types of out-of-home placements for youth. For individuals diagnosed with a serious emotional disturbance or mental disorder who cannot be safely treated in the community, a placement in a psychiatric residential treatment facility may be medically appropriate. Individuals whose primary diagnosis is a substance-related disorder who also need residential treatment may be referred to substance abuse and addiction programs.

A psychiatric residential treatment facility is a federally-defined treatment program and is usually called a Residential Treatment Center in Maryland. These placements are classified as medical treatment and they are funded through Medicaid, a State and federal dollar match, usually called Medical Assistance in Maryland. Medical Assistance covers the residential costs of such care, but not educational costs.

Educational costs in a residential treatment center must be covered by another source. This may be covered by the child's local school system, if the child has an Individualized Education Program that defines the individualized education objectives of a child who has been diagnosed with a disability, as defined by federal regulations, and the local school system determines the child's educational needs cannot be met in a regular public school. Otherwise, these educational costs must be covered by another source, such as the budgeted placement funding of the Department of Human Resources Social Services Administration or that of the Department of Juvenile Services.

Residential treatment centers provide intensive supervision and behavioral health treatment to children and youth who meet medical necessity criteria with high levels of clinical need requiring residential treatment which cannot be met in typical community placements and outpatient treatment.


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 (Table 100). This is largely due to the use of the wraparound model of community-based care in which specialized services can be added to the more usual outpatient mental health service array.

These wraparound services were first piloted in Maryland through a federal grant and a 1915(c) Home and Community-Based Medicaid demonstration waiver between 2009 and 2012. Behavioral Health has recently implemented a 1915(i) Medicaid State Plan Amendment that allows for the provision of community-based services using a wraparound model for children and their families on an ongoing basis.

Behavioral Health, with the partnership of its Administrative Services Organization, Beacon Health Options, is also monitoring the lengths of stay of children in residential treatment centers to ensure they do not stay in that level of care for longer than medically necessary. This process has resulted in a gradual decline in the length of stay.

Adolescents and young adults (to age 21) whose problems with substances require residential treatment are monitored through criteria developed and published by the American Society of Addiction Medicine. These criteria are used as guidelines for placement, continued stay and transfer/discharge of individuals with addiction and co-occurring conditions. All the residential substance treatment services are also shown in Table 100. All of these Level III Intermediate Care (28-day residential) services are covered by Medical Assistance for individuals under age 21.

The number of individuals who have received substance-related disorder treatment through these residential programs has remained steady over the five years from 2008 to 2014. As noted earlier, the substance and addictions treatment data was not available for this FY2015 report. It should be noted that the lack of data for FY2015 skews the data points in the accompanying graphs; this information will be updated in the FY2016 report.



| Behavioral Health Total Served | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Residential Treatment Center | 1,566 | 924 | 1,046 | 863 | 907 | 867 | -8.9% | -4.4% |
| Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs | 2,577 | 2,484 | 2,370 | 2,188 | 1,922 | Available 2016 | NA | NA |

Table 101

| Behavioral Health Placement Population Flow (Placements, Not Children) | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Residential Treatment Centers | | | | | |
| 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 |
| 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 |
| 2015 | 432 | 435 | 867 | 529 | 338 |
| Three-Year Change | -2.0% | -28.1% | -17.1% | -18.6% | -14.6% |
| Average Yearly Change | 0.0% | -1.3% | -0.9% | 8.6% | -8.4% |
| Recent Year Change | 7.7% | -9.4% | -1.6% | 10.9% | -16.3% |
| Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs <i>Data available in FY2016</i> | | | | | |
| 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 |
| 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 |
| 2015 | Available 2016 | Available 2016 | Available 2016 | Available 2016 | Available 2016 |
| Three-Year Change | Available 2016 | Available 2016 | Available 2016 | Available 2016 | Available 2016 |
| Average Yearly Change | Available 2016 | Available 2016 | Available 2016 | Available 2016 | Available 2016 |
| Recent Year Change | Available 2016 | Available 2016 | Available 2016 | Available 2016 | Available 2016 |

Table 102

Substance Abuse and Addictions Program data is also unavailable in the Behavioral Health Placement Population Flow (Placements, Not Children) Table 101. Furthermore, the percentage change data for the substance programs in Table 102 are incorrect for this reason. This will be corrected in the FY2016 report.

Nevertheless, the pattern of gradual decline in residential substance abuse placements is also observed here, although the substance treatment numbers have only shown slight declines. The population flow data (new placements, discharges and total placements) for the substance abuse programs is much higher than that seen in the Residential Treatment Centers. Length of stay in the substance treatment programs are the typical 28-day stays, although any given individual may have had more than one admission during any given year. Therefore, the beds in the substance programs turn over on the order of ten times more often than do residential treatment center beds.

The residential treatment center data shows a pattern of overall gradual decline over the past five years as seen in Table 100. The population flow numbers (new placements, discharges and total placements) for the residential treatment centers are much lower than for the substance programs because of the much longer lengths of stay for these individuals. The FY2015 data are consistent with the population flow data for the residential treatment centers over the previous four years.

Behavioral Health 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 | 4 | 1.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Anne Arundel | 22 | 5.7% | 0 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Baltimore | 70 | 18.2% | 0 | 0 | 19 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Baltimore City | 73 | 19.0% | 0 | 0 | 30 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | |
| Calvert | 2 | 0.5% | 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 | |
| Caroline | 5 | 1.3% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Carroll | 5 | 1.3% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Cecil | 8 | 2.1% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Charles | 5 | 1.3% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Dorchester | 10 | 2.6% | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Frederick | 32 | 8.3% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Garrett | 3 | 0.8% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Harford | 17 | 4.4% | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Howard | 4 | 1.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 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 | 55 | 14.3% | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Prince George's | 19 | 4.9% | 0 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 3 | 0.8% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| St. Mary's | 5 | 1.3% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Talbot | 2 | 0.5% | 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 | |
| Washington | 9 | 2.3% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Wicomico | 16 | 4.2% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Worcester | 2 | 0.5% | 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 | |
| Out-of-State | 14 | 3.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 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 | 385 | 100.0% | 0 | 0 | 95 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 27.1% | 54.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 68.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 52.7% | 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% | 24.7% | 42.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.3% | 10.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 8.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | |

Table 103

Table 103 shows where children from the 24 Maryland jurisdictions were placed on January 31, 2015. All of these are mental health residential treatment center placements. One should note that 12 children from Maryland jurisdictions were placed in out-of-State residential treatment centers on January 31, 2015. However, there were also 14 children listed as having home out-of-State jurisdictions who were placed in out-of-State centers.

Although placement within (or near) a youth’s jurisdiction is one factor considered in placing a child in a residential treatment center, the primary determinants are the youth’s treatment needs (not all residential treatment centers offer the same services) and whether a particular program has a vacancy at the time of referral or anticipates one within a reasonable time frame.


Children are clearly not placed in each of the Maryland jurisdictions. The in-State residential treatment centers are located in Baltimore County (4), Baltimore City (2), Montgomery County (2), Dorchester County (1), and Frederick County (1). Youth from jurisdictions other than these five will necessarily be placed outside his/her jurisdiction. In addition, each individual center determines which youth will be admitted, considering the child’s needs, their programming and vacancy constraints at the time of admission.



| Behavioral Health Cost Data | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Residential Treatment Centers | \$91,629,633 | \$72,649,911 | \$71,180,664 | \$66,348,547 | \$67,700,710 | \$69,286,039 | -5.0% | -20.9% |
| Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs | \$5,479,180 | \$5,412,365 | \$4,739,245 | \$3,676,839 | \$3,003,888 | NA | NA | NA |
| Total | \$97,108,813 | \$78,062,276 | \$75,919,909 | \$70,025,386 | \$70,704,598 | \$69,286,039 | -6.2% | -2.0% |

Table 104

Table 104 shows Medicaid costs for children in residential treatment centers and in Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs. (Note again that there is no substance treatment data for FY2015.) Residential treatment center and substance treatment costs have remained relatively steady – for the past four years beginning in FY2011 for residential treatment center costs and for the four years beginning FY2010 for substance treatment programs. Total residential treatment center costs can vary by the number of youth who are placed, by specific placements as programs receive different reimbursement, and program costs themselves can also vary year to year.




| Behavioral Health Cost Per Bed-Day | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Residential Treatment Centers | \$432 | \$453 | \$460 | \$458 | \$475 | \$490 | 2.6% | -18.4% |
| Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs | \$85 | \$87 | \$71 | \$59 | \$48 | NA | NA | NA |

Table 105

These figures represent the medical assistance costs for all youth placed by the Behavioral Health Administration in residential treatment centers and those placed in substance abuse and addictions programs divided by the number of bed days (the total number of days in residential treatment for all youth placed in these treatment programs). Residential treatment center costs overall can vary year to year and have increased slightly over the past five years. Substance Abuse and Addiction Program costs have declined over the four years beginning FY2010. (Note again there is no substance treatment data for FY2015.)

Behavioral Health Addendum Subcategory Totals Demographic Comparisons


Age



| Behavioral Health Age Trends | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Age | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| 0 through 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | NA | NA |
| 6 through 11 | 32 | 50 | 49 | 88 | 51 | 48 | 17.2% | -5.9% |
| 12 through 17 | 406 | 351 | 285 | 301 | 340 | 318 | -4.0% | -6.5% |
| 18 and over | 44 | 39 | 36 | 3 | 27 | 18 | 131.2% | -33.3% |
| Total | 482 | 440 | 371 | 393 | 418 | 385 | -4.0% | -7.9% |

Table 116


Race



| Behavioral Health Race Trends | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Race | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| American Indian / Alaskan | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 46.7% | 100.0% |
| Asian | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | -1.7% | -25.0% |
| Black or African American | 316 | 290 | 222 | 257 | 287 | 208 | -6.4% | -27.5% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| White | 339 | 308 | 276 | 253 | 278 | 137 | -13.7% | -50.7% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 28 | 0 | NA | -100.0% |
| Other | 30 | 23 | 30 | 31 | 14 | 25 | 6.8% | 78.6% |
| Unknown | 0 | 16 | 15 | 22 | 1 | 10 | NA | 900.0% |
| Total | 690 | 644 | 551 | 393 | 613 | 385 | -6.2% | -37.2% |

Table 118

Gender



| Behavioral Health Gender Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Gender | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Male | 430 | 425 | 361 | 367 | 409 | 239 | -8.9% | -41.6% |
| Female | 259 | 219 | 190 | 201 | 213 | 144 | -9.9% | -32.4% |
| Unknown | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 690 | 644 | 551 | 568 | 622 | 383 | -9.4% | -38.4% |

Table 117

Behavioral Health Addendum

Subcategory Totals Demographic Comparisons





Table 119

Table 119 and the accompanying chart show the number of children placed in out-of-State residential treatment centers whose care is paid by Medicaid. As noted earlier, Health and Mental Hygiene pays all residential treatment center Medicaid claims regardless of which agency (usually Human Resources or Juvenile Services) makes the referrals and arranges the placement. Although the number of children whose placements are funded by Medicaid and who are sent to out-of-State residential treatment centers is small, there has been a substantial increase in these numbers over the past two years. Information from our clinical monitoring at Behavioral Health suggests there has been a small increase in the number of children with intensive needs presenting to all of the child-serving agencies in Maryland. In this year's data, four of the 26 Medicaid funded placements were placed by Behavioral Health through its local Core Service Agencies. The remaining 22 cases were placed by Human Resources through Social Services, about two-thirds, and Juvenile Services, about one-third.

Maryland State Department of Education Summary


Local School Systems are required to provide a Free Appropriate Public Education 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 team process. The Individualized Education Program team, including the parent, determines the services required, the type of program, and identifies the location for the delivery of services. The Individualized Education Program 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 Program and to provide a Free Appropriate Public Education.

An out-of-home placement only occurs for a student placed by a Local School System, 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 diagnosed with disabilities. The Local School Systems are experiencing a continued decline in the number of children requiring residential services through the Individualized Education Program 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 diagnosed with severe autism and severe emotional disabilities enter their teenage and young adult years, providing educational services for these students with intensive needs may become increasingly challenging. As the child gets older, community-based services may have been exhausted. Older students with residential needs frequently remain in residential schools until they transition to adult services. The Local School Systems are required to provide special education and related services through the school year in which the child turns 21.



| Education Placement Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | 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-Residential Treatment Centers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Residential Educational Facilities | 58 | 44 | 58 | 53 | 47 | 45 | NA | -4.3% |
| Residential Treatment Centers | 37 | 22 | 0 | 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 |
| Total | 95 | 66 | 58 | 53 | 47 | 45 | -13.4% | -4.3% |

Table 120



| Education Total Served | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Category | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 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 | 96 | 69 | 70 | 58 | 47 | 45 | -13.4% | -4.3% |
| Hospitalization | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Not Available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 96 | 69 | 70 | 58 | 47 | 45 | -13.4% | -4.3% |

Table 121


| Education 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 |
| 2011 | 49 | 20 | 69 | 11 | 58 |
| 2012 | 34 | 36 | 70 | 9 | 61 |
| 2013 | 33 | 25 | 58 | 5 | 53 |
| 2014 | 38 | 15 | 53 | 6 | 47 |
| 2015 | 29 | 19 | 48 | 7 | 41 |
| Three-Year Change | -14.7% | -47.2% | -31.4% | -22.2% | -32.8% |
| Average Yearly Change | -8.4% | 7.2% | -6.7% | -5.2% | -6.4% |
| Recent Year Change | -23.7% | 26.7% | -9.4% | 16.7% | -12.8% |

Table 122

A school system may find it necessary to place a student in an appropriate out-of-State residential school because of the unique needs of that student. Prior to making this decision for the student, the Individualized Education Program team must consider the appropriateness of all in-State residential schools including the proximity of the school placement to the child's home. When reviewing the profiles of the students placed out-of-State, a wide variation of needs, ages, grade placements and goals for the students is noted. As a result of the low demand for the types of programs needed, development of similar specialized programs within Maryland may not be reasonable and sustainable for a private provider.

| Education 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 | 5 | 11.1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Baltimore City | 3 | 6.7% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Calvert | 1 | 2.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Caroline | 1 | 2.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 | 2.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 | 8 | 17.8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 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 | 6.7% | 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 | 2.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kent | 2 | 4.4% | 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 | 16 | 35.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Prince George's | 4 | 8.9% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 45 | 100.0% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 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% | 25.0% | 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% | 2.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 0.0% | 8.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 8.9% | 0.0% | 17.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 28.9% | 0.0% |

Table 123



| Education Total Costs | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| Subcategory | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Residential Educational Facilities | \$13,918,875 | \$12,672,875 | \$11,690,683 | \$11,607,471 | \$10,972,899 | \$10,003,490 | -6.3% | -8.8% |
| Total | \$13,918,875 | \$12,672,875 | \$11,690,683 | \$11,607,471 | \$10,972,899 | \$10,003,490 | -6.3% | -8.8% |

Table 124


Maryland State Department of Education Strategies

The Maryland State Department of Education Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services has worked directly with Maryland private day and residential education facilities to build in-State capacity for students requiring intensive services. Education provides ongoing support and technical assistance to Autism Waiver providers and others to build capacity and quality programming for students. During the 2015-2016 school year, the Division will continue to support local school systems to enhance services and supports for students to remain in their community schools. The Maryland State Department of Education will continue working with Maryland providers to meet the increasing needs of this population.

Education 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.

Education Addendum Subcategory Totals Demographic Comparisons

Age




Education Non-Community-Based Age Trends

| | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| 0 through 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| 6 through 11 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | -30.0% | -100.0% |
| 12 through 17 | 33 | 23 | 28 | 24 | 21 | 21 | -7.1% | 0.0% |
| 18 and over | 58 | 39 | 28 | 27 | 24 | 24 | -15.1% | 0.0% |
| Total | 95 | 66 | 58 | 53 | 47 | 45 | -13.4% | -4.3% |

Table 125

Race




Education Non-Community-Based Race Trends

| | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| American Indian / Alaskan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Asian | 3 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 25.3% | 0.0% |
| Black or African American | 27 | 15 | 13 | 14 | 13 | 10 | -16.1% | -23.1% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| White | 61 | 47 | 37 | 29 | 29 | 30 | -12.5% | 3.4% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Other | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | NA | 0.0% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 95 | 66 | 58 | 53 | 47 | 45 | -13.4% | -4.3% |

Table 127

Gender



Education Non-Community-Based Gender Trends


| | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| Male | 72 | 48 | 41 | 38 | 39 | 39 | -10.5% | 0.0% |
| Female | 23 | 18 | 17 | 15 | 8 | 6 | -22.1% | -25.0% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 95 | 66 | 58 | 53 | 47 | 45 | -13.4% | -4.3% |

Table 126

Education Addendum

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


Out-of-State Placement Trends



| Education Out-of-State Non-Community-Based Trends | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Residential Educational Facilities | 0 | 0 | 20 | 15 | 17 | 13 | NA | -23.5% |
| Residential Treatment Centers | 37 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 37 | 22 | 20 | 15 | 17 | 13 | -1.9% | -23.5% |

Table 128


Out-of-State Age



| Education Out-of-State Age Trends | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| 0 through 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| 6 through 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | -20.0% | -100.0% |
| 12 through 17 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 5 | -10.2% | -16.7% |
| 18 and over | 27 | 14 | 13 | 7 | 10 | 8 | -15.7% | -20.0% |
| Total | 37 | 22 | 20 | 15 | 17 | 13 | -17.0% | -23.5% |

Table 129


Out-of-State Gender



| Education Out-of-State Gender Trends | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | Average Change | Last Year Change |
| Male | 31 | 15 | 12 | 8 | 11 | 10 | -15.3% | -9.1% |
| Female | 6 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 3 | -9.2% | -50.0% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 37 | 22 | 20 | 15 | 17 | 13 | -17.0% | -23.5% |

Table 130

Out-of-State Race



| Education Out-of-State Race Trends | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| | 1/31/2010 | 1/31/2011 | 1/31/2012 | 1/31/2013 | 1/31/2014 | 1/31/2015 | 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 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 4 | -16.0% | -33.3% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| White | 25 | 14 | 13 | 9 | 11 | 9 | -15.6% | -18.2% |
| Bi-Racial / Multiple Race | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Other | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| Total | 37 | 22 | 20 | 15 | 17 | 13 | -17.0% | -23.5% |

Table 131

Maryland School for the Blind and Maryland School for the Deaf

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

The Maryland School for the Deaf

The Maryland School for the Deaf is established under §8-304 of the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and 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 to notify parents or guardians of each hearing-impaired child of the availability of the educational programs offered by the Maryland School for the Deaf. The Maryland School for the Deaf is 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 county. The majority of students enrolled at the Maryland School for the Deaf are placed by parents or guardians rather than by a local school system. Children receiving enhanced services are placed by Local School Systems through the Individualized Education Program team process. A small number of students, placed by the Individualized Education Program 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 |
| 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 |
| FY2015 | 122 | \$2,701,397 | \$5,715,334 | \$8,416,731 |

Table 132

The Maryland School for the Blind

The Maryland School for the Blind is established to provide services for children placed by Local School Systems through the Individualized Education Program team process. In accordance with §8-307.1 of the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland each Local School System 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. The Maryland School for the Blind is required to establish and operate a program of enhanced services¹³ for students who are blind and have other diagnosed disabilities. Funding for these services is provided jointly by the State and county. The budget for the School is submitted annually by the Governor to the General Assembly. The residential program offers a continuum of service options. Students may

¹³ Enhanced services allow students to receive educational services in Maryland rather than out-of-State residential programs.

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 |
| 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 |
| FY2015 | 96 | \$5,238,300 | \$9,816,144 | \$15,054,444 |

Table 132

Family Preservation Services

The Department of Human Resources provides family preservation services to children and families 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 as In-Home or Family Preservation services.

From 1990 to the present, Interagency Family Preservation Services were added in Maryland as an interagency approach to preserving families with children at imminent risk of placement from all child-serving Agencies. Until FY2008, Family Preservation was administered by the Governor’s Office for Children, after which it was integrated into Human Resources’ 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 placement. Risk is assessed by the Maryland Family Risk Assessment, 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. Out-of-home placement is measured by the number of children entering out-of-home care. Both measures are analyzed here for incidents of maltreatment or out-of-home placement among children while they were receiving In-Home services, and for children who had recently received In-Home services.

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

1. Interagency Family Preservation Services; 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 will be presented, along with data for the two programs combined (Total In-Home Services).

Service Counts for Human Resources In-Home Services

Table 133 below contains five years of data for Total In-Home services, Consolidated In-Home services, and Family Preservation. A review of the last five years’ information on overall served cases indicates there was a 31% increase in the overall number of families and a corresponding 25% increase in the number of children served in In-Home programs from FY2011 to FY2015.

| Families and Children Served and Newly Served* | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------|------------|------------------------------|----------|------------|
| Total In-Home | | | | | | |
| | All Cases Served during Fiscal Year | | | New Cases during Fiscal Year | | |
| | 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 | 8,724 | 18,755 | 2.2 | 6,272 | 13,363 | 2.1 |
| FY 2014 | 8,626 | 18,137 | 2.1 | 6,706 | 13,805 | 2.1 |
| FY 2015 | 9,813 | 20,520 | 2.1 | 7,836 | 16,260 | 2.1 |
| Consolidated In-Home Services | | | | | | |
| | All Cases Served during Fiscal Year | | | New Cases during Fiscal Year | | |
| | 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 | 7,750 | 16,434 | 2.1 | 5,460 | 11,459 | 2.1 |
| FY 2014 | 7,658 | 15,936 | 2.1 | 5,959 | 12,130 | 2.0 |
| FY 2015 | 9,034 | 18,764 | 2.1 | 7,242 | 14,944 | 2.1 |
| Interagency Family Preservation Services | | | | | | |
| | All Cases Served during Fiscal Year | | | New Cases during Fiscal Year | | |
| | 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 | 968 | 2,201 | 2.3 | 747 | 1,675 | 2.2 |
| FY 2015 | 779 | 1,756 | 2.3 | 594 | 1,316 | 2.2 |

*FY 2013 – 2014 data revised

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 Human Resources out-of-home placements had been decreasing significantly as well. In-Home served families continue to increase from year to year. The number of In-Home served families has increased substantially (16%) since FY2014; this is in keeping with the percentage increase observed from FY2011 to FY2012. Among some stakeholders, there had been the belief that if Human Resources out-of-home care placements were decreasing, then In-Home services should increase; this argument, however, ignored the increasing impact of Human Resources’ 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 obviates the need for Human Resources/Social Services 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 Human Resources 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 Human Resources), 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 Child Protective Services investigator, upon completion of an investigation, that there is sufficient evidence, which has not been refuted, of child maltreatment. (There are two other Child Protective Services 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.)

Out-of-home placements begin with a removal from the home of a child, which occurs when the child’s safety cannot be assured in the home. The date of removal marks the beginning of the out-of-home placement episode.¹⁴

In this analysis, only Human Resources out-of-home placements are discussed—while other Maryland agencies place or fund the placement of children, this section discusses only Human Resources out-of-home placement among the children who have participated in Human Resources’ In-Home services, as these placements are generally due only to child maltreatment. (There is a small although growing proportion of placements due to children’s severe medical/mental health/developmental needs, through Voluntary Placement Agreements: 4% as of August 2010 and 6% as of August 2015.)

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

- Did a Child Protective Services investigation result in an indicated finding for children receiving In-Home services?
- Did an out-of-home 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.

¹⁴ It should be noted that 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.

| Measure | Timeframes | |
|--|--|--|
| Did a Child Protective Services 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"> the In-Home service close date; or 12 months following the start date of In-Home services. | <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. 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. |
| Did a Human Resources out-of-home placement occur for children receiving service? | | |

Table 134

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 was observed a year after case closing to determine whether a Child Protective Services Indicated Investigation or Human Resources out-of-home 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 one year of case closure are available for children newly served in FY2013, and data for events occurring during services is available for children who entered In-Home services in FY2014.

Using this construct, Table 135 shows the number children who began In-Home services in FYs 2009-2015, and those who started In-Home services in those years but also completed services within 12 months of their service start date. Although Table 135 includes data on cases (i.e., families), subsequent data on indicated maltreatment and out-of-home placement will focus on children, not cases.

| Fiscal Year | Total In-Home Cases* | | | | | |
|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| | 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 | 6,273 | 5,556 | 89% | 13,356 | 11,776 | 88% |
| FY2014 | 6,707 | 6,012 | 90% | 13,805 | 12,283 | 89% |
| FY2015 | 7,836 | N/A until FY16 | | 16,260 | N/A until FY16 | |

*FY2013– 2014 data revised

Table 135

Over the past seven fiscal years, the percentage of cases (families) and children that complete services within one year of beginning In-Home services is between 87% and 90%.

| Indicated Child Protective Services Findings and Foster Care Placement Rates (Total In-Home Cases) | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------|-----------------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|-----------------------------|--------|
| Total In-Home Cases | | | | | | | | |
| Fiscal Year | Indicated Child Protective Services 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 | 2.7% | 366 | 2.8% | 325 | 4.3% | 569 | 2.3% | 267 |
| FY 2014 | 2.0% | 272 | NA until FY16 | | 3.6% | 498 | NA until FY16 | |

*FY 2013 data revised

Table 136

Indicated Child Protective Service Investigations/Child Maltreatment

During the past six 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 FYs 2012 and 2013, and 4.2% in FY2011 (Table 137). Despite these fluctuations, since FY2009, the average percentage of children not experiencing indicated maltreatment during In-Home services is 96.9%; for FY2014 the percentage was 98%.

Within one year of case closure, an average of 3.3% of children experienced an indicated finding of maltreatment; therefore, since FY2009, an average of 96.7% of children did not experience an indicated maltreatment finding up to one year after finishing In-Home services (Table 137).

Consolidated In-Home Services and Interagency Family Preservation Services have both seen a sizable decrease in the number of children experiencing an indicated Child Protective Service Investigation during services (Table 137). For the one-year period after services, however, there is mixed experience, with the Consolidated In-Home cases experiencing a decrease (from 3.3% in FY2012 to 2.7% in FY2013), and Family Preservation experiencing an increase (from 2.7% in FY2012 to 3.1% in FY2013). Part of the reason for the overall downward trend in indicated Child Protective Service investigations among children receiving In-Home services may be the implementation of Alternative Response.

| Indicated Child Protective Services Findings and Out-of-Home Care Placement Rates | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------|-----------------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|-----------------------------|--------|
| Consolidated In-Home Services | | | | | | | | |
| Fiscal Year | Indicated Child Protective Services 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 | 2.9% | 333 | 2.7% | 272 | 4.4% | 499 | 2.2% | 216 |
| FY2014 | 2.1% | 249 | NA until FY 16 | | 3.6% | 440 | NA until FY 16 | |
| Interagency Family Preservation Services | | | | | | | | |
| Fiscal Year | Indicated Child Protective Services 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 | 1.7% | 33 | 3.1% | 53 | 3.7% | 70 | 2.9% | 51 |
| FY 2014 | 1.4 | 23 | NA until FY 16 | | 3.5% | 58 | NA until FY 16 | |

*FY 2013 data revised

Table 137

Alternative Response

During FY2014, Maryland phased in the implementation of Alternative Response, and as of July 2014 the State had completed the Alternative Response implementation. Alternative Response provides families at risk of child maltreatment with a different pathway for low risk allegations of child abuse and neglect, featuring an engagement approach in order to support families, rather than the investigation-oriented traditional Child Protective Service response. Since July 2013, there has been a growing presence of Alternative Response in Maryland, and currently an average of 45% of new reports of child maltreatment are assigned to Alternative Response.

Alternative Response uses a family-centered approach to families where workers seek to engage a family using assessments that lead to services to address identified risk and safety concerns as opposed to investigating to identify an individual as responsible for the alleged abuse/neglect. As required by statute, an independent evaluation of the implementation was conducted and the final two-year evaluation report has been submitted to the Maryland General Assembly.

It is possible that the decrease in the number of indicated Child Protective Service investigations among the children served in family preservation programs may in part be due to Alternative Response implementation, which was expanding through the first year of implementation during FY2014. Next year's report will bring new information about Alternative Response's impact on indicated Child Protective Service investigations among the children served in In-Home Programs.

Out-of-Home Placement

Although there was a slight increase in FY2011 (5.2%), the general rate of out-of-home placement during In-Home services has ranged from 4.0% to 4.6%, dropping to 4.3% in FY2013. Overall, an average of 95.6% of children served in In-Home services from FY2009 to FY2014 was able to remain with their families during In-Home services, and avoid out-of-home placement.

Out-of-home placement in the year following In-Home services has been stable, between 2.2% and 2.5% for the past five years, with the lowest rate (2.2%) in FY2012. For these past five years, an average of 97.7% of children remain in their home and avoided out-of-home placement within the first year after receiving In-Home services.

For out-of-home placement, a slightly lower percentage of children in Family Preservation entered out-of-home care during services than Consolidated services – in FY2014, 3.5% of children in Family Preservation services entered out-of-home care, compared to 3.6% in Consolidated services. After care, however, there is a slightly higher rate among children who had received Family Preservation than Consolidated (2.9% versus 2.2%, respectively, based on FY2013 rates).

Analysis of Maryland Family Risk Assessment for In-Home Services

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

Human Resources In-Home workers are required to complete a Maryland Family Risk Assessment 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 Maryland Family Risk Assessment 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.

Maryland implemented the use of Child and Family Needs and Strengths – Family version assessment to support strengths-based case plans and In-Home services. Data on its use and impact on service and delivery will be included in next year's report.

Maryland Family Risk Assessment Intake Ratings

Within two weeks of starting an In-Home service case, workers are required to complete a Maryland Family Risk Assessment rating for the family. Data, however, are not available for an average of 19% of In-Home cases for FY2011 through FY2015, with increasing proportions missing during each of last two fiscal years. There are a couple reasons for this trend: the Maryland Family Risk Assessment may be completed during the Child Protective Services response and then shared with the In-Home services team, and so it is not a formal part of the In-Home service record; and caseworkers may be completing the Risk Assessment in a paper-version but not recording the results in MD CHESSIE.

Human Resources is concerned about this problem, and will be focusing its efforts to correct this by exploring the use of Maryland Family Risk Assessment ratings made during the Child Protective Services response for next year's update of this report. Human Resources has been working on correcting documentation issues through the use of new reporting system available to caseworkers and supervisors to monitor the milestones reached during each case, such as the completion of both safety and risk assessments. Through the use of the new reporting system (starting in the winter of 2016), which will facilitate supervision of caseworkers, Human Resources believes that Maryland Family Risk Assessment documentation and reporting will improve.

It should be noted that safety, not risk, is the determining factor in deciding if children must be removed from their family of origin and placed into out-of-home 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 out-of-home services than In-Home services.

| Initial Risk based on Maryland Family Risk Assessment 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% |
| FY 2015 | 9,813 | 16% | 31% | 26% | 6% | 22% |
| 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% |
| FY 2015 | 9,035 | 16% | 32% | 24% | 5% | 22% |
| 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 2015 | 778 | 6% | 23% | 49% | 11% | 12% |

*FY 2011 – 2013 data revised

Table 138

Table 138 shows initial Maryland Family Risk Assessment ratings. In Family Preservation cases over the past five years, the largest proportion of families have moderate risk levels; however, Consolidated In-Home Services largest proportion of families has shifted from moderate risk level to low risk level for FY2014 and FY2015. Among Consolidated In-Home cases, those with no risk represented a higher proportion of cases than those with high risk in FYs 2012 through 2015, while the reverse is true for Family Preservation. Overall, over a third of all families in FY2015 (32%) had moderate or high risk at the initial Maryland Family Risk Assessment evaluation.

Family Preservation Summary

Human Resources In-Home services are a critical component of meeting the needs of thousands of vulnerable children and their families. In FY2015, approximately 20,500 children from 9,800 families received Human Resources In-Home services (Table 133).

Among those who had an initial Maryland Family Risk Assessment in FY2015:

- 32% had moderate to high risk at the initial assessment

Among those served in In-Home services, based on FY2014 entries (most recent year for which data is available):

- 98.0% of children did not experience an indicated finding for maltreatment during services, and
- 96.4% remained with their families and were not removed into a Human Resources out-of-home placement during services.

Among those children whose In-Home services ended, based on FY2013 entries (the most recent year for which data is available):

- 97.2% of children did not experience an indicated finding for maltreatment within one year of case closure, and
- 98.7% remain with their families and were not removed into a Human Resources out-of-home placement within one year of case closure.

As of July 31, 2015, there were 4,817 children in Human Resources out-of-home care (Human Resources StateStat Place Matters file, July 2015 data). This is the lowest number of children requiring removal from their homes in over 27 years. The provision of Human Resources In-Home services and other community supports are crucial in keeping children in their homes and families.

Human Resources' 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 Human Resources' out-of-home and In-Home practice models, which also rely on community supports and services. Providing Alternative Response, 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.

Conclusion

Out-of-home placements have been decreasing over time and the decline was especially sharp this year. Placements have decreased an average of 10% in each of the last five years. New placements are down from 11 placements per 1,000 youth in 2011 to 7.47 in this fiscal year. In FY2015, there were nearly 63% more exits (youth returning to their families, being adopted, or aging out of care) than there were new placements.

Out-of-State placements have fluctuated over the last five years, but have averaged a 4% decrease overall. Non-community-based placements increased by nearly one-fifth (19.8%) from FY2014 to FY2015. These placements included residential treatment centers, residential education facilities, and juvenile detention centers. Common reasons for choosing to place out of state are because a youth has both acute medical issues and developmental disabilities; a history of running away or aggression; a youth needs a less restrictive placement but is also a sex offender; or an out-of-State facility's location may be more convenient for the family.

The cost of out-of-home placements has risen 14.2% from FY2014 to FY2015, with all of the increase due to a rise in costs related to non-community-based placements. Out-of-State placements represented about 6.5% of all costs and their cost has risen an average of 4.3% since FY2010, but has been trending downward over the last four years.

APPENDIX: Placement by Jurisdiction

Family Home, Adoptive

| | | 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 | 2 | 4.9% | 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 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Baltimore | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Baltimore City | 4 | 9.8% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Calvert | 7 | 17.1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Caroline | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Carroll | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Cecil | 2 | 4.9% | 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 | |
| Charles | 4 | 9.8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Dorchester | 1 | 2.4% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Frederick | 2 | 4.9% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Garrett | 1 | 2.4% | 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 | |
| Harford | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Howard | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Kent | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Montgomery | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Prince George's | 2 | 4.9% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| Queen Anne's | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Somerset | 2 | 4.9% | 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 | |
| St. Mary's | 2 | 4.9% | 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 | 2 | 4.9% | 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 | |
| Washington | 8 | 19.5% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Wicomico | 2 | 4.9% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Unknown | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Grand Total | 41 | 100.0% | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 4 | |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 75.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 7.3% | 2.4% | 0.0% | 7.3% | 17.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4.9% | 7.3% | 0.0% | 2.4% | 2.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4.9% | 4.9% | 19.5% | 4.9% | 0.0% | 9.8% | 0.0% |

Family Home, Foster Care

| Home Jurisdiction of Children | # children from jurisdiction in placement | % of children Statewide in placements from jurisdiction | Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|--------------|-----------|----------------|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|------------|-----------|---------|---------|--------|--------|------------|-----------------|--------------|----------|------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | 30 | 2.9% | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Anne Arundel | 55 | 5.3% | 0 | 47 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Baltimore | 122 | 11.8% | 0 | 0 | 97 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Baltimore City | 279 | 27.1% | 0 | 1 | 49 | 201 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | |
| Calvert | 15 | 1.5% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Caroline | 12 | 1.2% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Carroll | 15 | 1.5% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Cecil | 84 | 8.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Charles | 24 | 2.3% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dorchester | 2 | 0.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Frederick | 29 | 2.8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Garrett | 10 | 1.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Harford | 65 | 6.3% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Howard | 10 | 1.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Kent | 4 | 0.4% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Montgomery | 83 | 8.1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Prince George's | 62 | 6.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Queen Anne's | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Somerset | 10 | 1.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| St. Mary's | 32 | 3.1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Talbot | 6 | 0.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington | 58 | 5.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Wicomico | 7 | 0.7% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Worcester | 11 | 1.1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 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 | 4 | 0.4% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 1,030 | 100.0 | 28 | 50 | 151 | 221 | 14 | 16 | 15 | 85 | 27 | 5 | 31 | 13 | 68 | 17 | 5 | 80 | 57 | 1 | 9 | 30 | 1 | 53 | 13 | 5 | 29 | 6 |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 93.3% | 85.5% | 79.5% | 72.0% | 80.0% | 66.7% | 86.7% | 96.4% | 95.8% | 100.0% | 93.1% | 100.0% | 96.9% | 90.0% | 100.0% | 92.8% | 87.1% | 100.0% | 80.0% | 93.8% | 16.7% | 89.7% | 100.0% | 36.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 2.7% | 4.9% | 14.7% | 21.5% | 1.4% | 1.6% | 1.5% | 8.3% | 2.6% | 0.5% | 3.0% | 1.3% | 6.6% | 1.7% | 0.5% | 7.8% | 5.5% | 0.1% | 0.9% | 2.9% | 0.1% | 5.1% | 1.3% | 0.5% | 2.8% | 0.6% |

Family Home, Relative Care

| Home Jurisdiction of Children | # children from jurisdiction in placement | % of children Statewide in placements from jurisdiction | Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|--------------|-----------|----------------|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|------------|-----------|---------|---------|--------|------|------------|-----------------|--------------|----------|------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| | | | Allegany | Anne Arundel | Baltimore | Baltimore City | Calvert | Caroline | Carroll | Cecil | Charles | Dorchester | Frederick | Garrett | Harford | Howard | Kent | Montgomery | Prince George's | Queen Anne's | Somerset | St. Mary's | Talbot | Washington | Wicomico | Worcester | Out-of-State | Unknown |
| Allegany | 18 | 3.2% | 18 | 0 | 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 | 14 | 2.5% | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 |
| Baltimore | 15 | 2.7% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Baltimore City | 303 | 54.4% | 0 | 6 | 57 | 208 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 3 | |
| Calvert | 1 | 0.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Caroline | 4 | 0.7% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Carroll | 5 | 0.9% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Cecil | 16 | 2.9% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | |
| Charles | 7 | 1.3% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | |
| Dorchester | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Frederick | 14 | 2.5% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | |
| Garrett | 3 | 0.5% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Harford | 34 | 6.1% | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | |
| Howard | 5 | 0.9% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| 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 | 50 | 9.0% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | |
| Prince George's | 31 | 5.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Queen Anne's | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Somerset | 1 | 0.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| St. Mary's | 12 | 2.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Talbot | 4 | 0.7% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Washington | 13 | 2.3% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Wicomico | 5 | 0.9% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | |
| 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 | |
| Unknown | 2 | 0.4% | 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 |
| Grand Total | 557 | 100.0% | 19 | 11 | 70 | 224 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 25 | 17 | 0 | 33 | 34 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 23 | 28 |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 100.0% | 28.6% | 26.7% | 68.6% | 100.0% | 25.0% | 80.0% | 56.3% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 64.3% | 33.3% | 32.4% | 60.0% | 0.0% | 58.0% | 64.5% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 91.7% | 50.0% | 53.8% | 60.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 3.4% | 2.0% | 12.6% | 40.2% | 0.9% | 0.2% | 0.9% | 1.6% | 1.1% | 0.4% | 2.2% | 0.2% | 4.5% | 3.1% | 0.0% | 5.9% | 6.1% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 2.3% | 0.9% | 1.4% | 0.9% | 0.0% | 4.1% | 5.0% |

Family Home, Restricted Relative Care

| Home Jurisdiction of Children | # children from jurisdiction in placement | % of children Statewide in placements from jurisdiction | Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|--------------|-----------|----------------|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|------------|-----------|---------|---------|--------|------|------------|-----------------|--------------|----------|------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| | | | Allegany | Anne Arundel | Baltimore | Baltimore City | Calvert | Caroline | Carroll | Cecil | Charles | Dorchester | Frederick | Garrett | Harford | Howard | Kent | Montgomery | Prince George's | Queen Anne's | Somerset | St. Mary's | Talbot | Washington | Wicomico | Worcester | 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 | 2 | 0.7% | 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 | 38 | 13.0% | 0 | 2 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Baltimore City | 192 | 65.5% | 0 | 8 | 41 | 124 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| Calvert | 8 | 2.7% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| Cecil | 6 | 2.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 2 | 0.7% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 2 | 0.7% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 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 | 18 | 6.1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Prince George's | 7 | 2.4% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Queen Anne's | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Somerset | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| St. Mary's | 5 | 1.7% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 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 | 11 | 3.8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 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 | 293 | 100.0% | 0 | 13 | 62 | 127 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 0.0% | 100.0% | 55.3% | 64.6% | 62.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 83.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 61.1% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 40.0% | 0.0% | 90.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 0.0% | 4.4% | 21.2% | 43.3% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 1.7% | 1.0% | 0.3% | 1.4% | 0.0% | 5.1% | 1.0% | 0.0% | 4.1% | 3.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.0% | 3.4% | 0.3% | 0.0% | 5.5% | 0.3% |

Family Home, Treatment Foster 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 | 7 | 0.5% | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Anne Arundel | 44 | 3.0% | 0 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Baltimore | 178 | 12.1% | 3 | 2 | 91 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Baltimore City | 701 | 47.5% | 0 | 16 | 296 | 298 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 15 | 0 | 3 | 27 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | |
| Calvert | 14 | 0.9% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Caroline | 7 | 0.5% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Carroll | 6 | 0.4% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Cecil | 25 | 1.7% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Charles | 19 | 1.3% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Dorchester | 12 | 0.8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Frederick | 19 | 1.3% | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Garrett | 2 | 0.1% | 1 | 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 | |
| Harford | 41 | 2.8% | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Howard | 10 | 0.7% | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Kent | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Montgomery | 79 | 5.3% | 0 | 2 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | |
| Prince George's | 203 | 13.7% | 0 | 1 | 15 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 10 | 0.7% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| St. Mary's | 28 | 1.9% | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Talbot | 7 | 0.5% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Washington | 27 | 1.8% | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Wicomico | 17 | 1.2% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Worcester | 16 | 1.1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Out-of-State | 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 | 0 |
| Unknown | 4 | 0.3% | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 1477 | 100 | 14 | 32 | 451 | 404 | 8 | 7 | 18 | 1 | 23 | 17 | 6 | 4 | 65 | 32 | 3 | 36 | 224 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 49 | 41 | 1 | 0 | 7 | |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 57.1% | 18.2% | 51.1% | 42.5% | 7.1% | 28.6% | 0.0% | 12.0% | 47.4% | 58.3% | 5.3% | 0.0% | 43.9% | 10.0% | 0.0% | 36.7% | 72.9% | 0.0% | 10.0% | 0.0% | 28.6% | 66.7% | 94.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 0.9% | 2.2% | 30.5% | 27.4% | 0.5% | 0.5% | 1.2% | 0.7% | 1.6% | 1.2% | 0.4% | 0.3% | 4.4% | 2.2% | 0.2% | 2.4% | 15.2% | 0.1% | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 3.3% | 2.8% | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.5% | |

Family Home, 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 | 4 | 2.1% | 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 | 7 | 3.6% | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Baltimore | 30 | 15.4% | 0 | 1 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Baltimore City | 42 | 21.5% | 1 | 2 | 2 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Calvert | 3 | 1.5% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 2 | 1.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cecil | 12 | 6.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Charles | 7 | 3.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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 | 7 | 3.6% | 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 | 22 | 11.3% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Howard | 3 | 1.5% | 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 | 1 |
| Kent | 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 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Montgomery | 18 | 9.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Prince George's | 14 | 7.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 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 | 0.5% | 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 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 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 | 21 | 10.8% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Wicomico | 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 |
| 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 | 195 | 100.0 | 6 | 7 | 14 | 52 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 31 |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 100.0% | 57.1% | 36.7% | 71.4% | 66.7% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 75.0% | 42.9% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 40.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 72.2% | 42.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 76.2% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 3.1% | 3.6% | 7.2% | 26.7% | 1.0% | 0.5% | 1.0% | 5.1% | 1.5% | 0.0% | 5.1% | 0.0% | 5.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.7% | 5.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 8.2% | 0.5% | 0.0% | 3.1% | 15.9% |

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 | 1 | 0.6% | 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 |
| Anne Arundel | 8 | 4.6% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Baltimore | 23 | 13.2% | 0 | 0 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Baltimore City | 111 | 63.8% | 0 | 0 | 43 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Calvert | 2 | 1.1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Carroll | 1 | 0.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cecil | 1 | 0.6% | 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 | 1 | 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 | 0 |
| Dorchester | 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 | 0 | 0 |
| Frederick | 1 | 0.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 | 1.7% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Howard | 6 | 3.4% | 0 | 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 |
| 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 | 9 | 5.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prince George's | 5 | 2.9% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 | 2 | 1.1% | 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 |
| 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 | 174 | 100.0% | 0 | 0 | 69 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 43.5% | 56.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 77.8% | 100.0% | 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% | 39.7% | 44.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.1% | 1.1% | 0.0% | 5.7% | 5.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.6% |

Community, Residential Child Care Program

| | | 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 | 7 | 1.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Anne Arundel | 26 | 3.6% | 2 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Baltimore | 85 | 11.8% | 1 | 2 | 38 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 |
| Baltimore City | 196 | 27.3% | 1 | 1 | 39 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 |
| Calvert | 7 | 1.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Caroline | 4 | 0.6% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Carroll | 12 | 1.7% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Cecil | 21 | 2.9% | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Charles | 18 | 2.5% | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Dorchester | 7 | 1.0% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Frederick | 27 | 3.8% | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Garrett | 7 | 1.0% | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Harford | 26 | 3.6% | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Howard | 23 | 3.2% | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Kent | 6 | 0.8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Montgomery | 74 | 10.3% | 0 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Prince George's | 89 | 12.4% | 1 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 |
| Queen Anne's | 2 | 0.3% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Somerset | 5 | 0.7% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| St. Mary's | 14 | 1.9% | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Talbot | 7 | 1.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington | 36 | 5.0% | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Wicomico | 10 | 1.4% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Worcester | 4 | 0.6% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Out-of-State | 5 | 0.7% | 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 | 0 |
| Unknown | 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 |
| Grand Total | 719 | 100 | 20 | 5 | 148 | 126 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 17 | 11 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 85 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 81 | 1 | 0 | 43 | 10 |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 14.3% | 0.0% | 44.7% | 44.4% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 14.3% | 16.7% | 0.0% | 7.4% | 28.6% | 26.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 37.8% | 21.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.1% | 0.0% | 52.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.0% | 0.0% |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 2.8% | 0.7% | 20.6% | 17.5% | 0.0% | 3.2% | 0.0% | 2.4% | 1.5% | 0.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 2.5% | 0.3% | 0.0% | 11.8% | 10.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0% | 11.3% | 0.1% | 0.0% | 6.0% | 1.4% |

Community, Community Supported 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 | 1 | 1.6% | 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 | |
| Anne Arundel | 1 | 1.6% | 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 |
| Baltimore | 5 | 8.1% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 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 | 3.2% | 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 | |
| Calvert | 3 | 4.8% | 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 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 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 | 5 | 8.1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Cecil | 1 | 1.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Charles | 1 | 1.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Dorchester | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 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 | 3 | 4.8% | 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 | 28 | 45.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Prince George's | 7 | 11.3% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 1.6% | 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 | 4.8% | 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 | 1 | 1.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Worcester | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 62 | 100.0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 28 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 80.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 1.6% | 1.6% | 6.5% | 4.8% | 4.8% | 0.0% | 8.1% | 1.6% | 1.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4.8% | 0.0% | 45.2% | 11.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.6% | 0.0% | 4.8% | 1.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | |

Community, 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 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 3 | 8.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Baltimore City | 16 | 45.7% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | |
| 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 | 1 | 2.9% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| 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 | 12 | 34.3% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |
| Prince George's | 2 | 5.7% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 1 | 2.9% | 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 | |
| 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 | 35 | 100.0% | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 6 | |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 5.7% | 0.0% | 5.7% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 5.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.9% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 8.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 5.7% | 0.0% | 11.4% | 17.1% | |

Non-Community, Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program

| 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 | 1 | 16.7% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Baltimore | 2 | 33.3% | 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 | 0 |
| Baltimore City | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 16.7% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dorchester | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Frederick | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Garrett | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Harford | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Howard | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kent | 1 | 16.7% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 | 0 |
| Prince George's | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Queen Anne's | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 1 | 16.7% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 | 6 | 100.0% | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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% | 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% | 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 | 1 | 0.8% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Anne Arundel | 12 | 9.6% | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Baltimore | 3 | 2.4% | 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 |
| Baltimore City | 25 | 20.0% | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | | | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Calvert | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Caroline | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Carroll | 2 | 1.6% | 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 |
| Cecil | 1 | 0.8% | 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 |
| Charles | 1 | 0.8% | 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 |
| 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 | 1.6% | 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 |
| Garrett | 1 | 0.8% | 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 | 2 | 1.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Howard | 1 | 0.8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 | 11 | 8.8% | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prince George's | 48 | 38.4% | 18 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 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 | 1.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| St. Mary's | 2 | 1.6% | 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 |
| 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 | 4.0% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wicomico | 5 | 4.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 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 | 0.8% | 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 |
| 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 | 125 | 100.0 | 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 |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 0.8% | 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% | 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 | # 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 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Anne Arundel | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Baltimore | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Baltimore City | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Calvert | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Caroline | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Carroll | 1 | 4.3% | 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 | |
| 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 | 16 | 69.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 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 | 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 | 1 | 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 | 1 | 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 | 1 | 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 | 3 | 13.0% | 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 | |
| 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 | 1 | 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 | 1 | 0 | |
| Grand Total | 23 | 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 | 23 | 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% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 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% |

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 | 5 | 11.1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | | | |
| Baltimore City | 3 | 6.7% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Calvert | 1 | 2.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Caroline | 1 | 2.2% | 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 | 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 | 0 | | | | |
| Cecil | 1 | 2.2% | 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 | 0 | | | | |
| Charles | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | | | | |
| Frederick | 8 | 17.8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 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 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Harford | 3 | 6.7% | 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Howard | 1 | 2.2% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Kent | 2 | 4.4% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Montgomery | 16 | 35.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Prince George's | 4 | 8.9% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Queen Anne's | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 45 | 100.0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 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% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 0.0% | 2.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 0.0% | 8.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 8.9% | 0.0% | 17.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 28.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

Non-Community, Residential Treatment Center

| 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 | 3 | 1.1% | 0 | 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 |
| Anne Arundel | 20 | 7.0% | 0 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Baltimore | 36 | 12.7% | 0 | 0 | 16 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| Baltimore City | 49 | 17.3% | 0 | 0 | 34 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | |
| Calvert | 5 | 1.8% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Caroline | 2 | 0.7% | 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 | 0 |
| Carroll | 7 | 2.5% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cecil | 9 | 3.2% | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Charles | 10 | 3.5% | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dorchester | 8 | 2.8% | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Frederick | 10 | 3.5% | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Garrett | 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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Harford | 14 | 4.9% | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Howard | 6 | 2.1% | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kent | 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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Montgomery | 26 | 9.2% | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | |
| Prince George's | 27 | 9.5% | 0 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 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 |
| Somerset | 3 | 1.1% | 0 | 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 |
| St. Mary's | 4 | 1.4% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Talbot | 3 | 1.1% | 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 |
| Washington | 14 | 4.9% | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Wicomico | 18 | 6.3% | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | |
| Worcester | 2 | 0.7% | 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 |
| Out-of-State | 6 | 2.1% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 284 | 100.0% | 0 | 0 | 130 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 3 | |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 44.4% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 37.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 19.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 0.0% | |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 45.8% | 19.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.8% | 8.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 8.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 11.3% | 1.1% | |

Non-Community, Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs*

| 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 | 5 | 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 | 0 |
| Anne Arundel | 2 | 1.7% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Baltimore | 6 | 5.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Baltimore City | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Calvert | 12 | 9.9% | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Caroline | 1 | 0.8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Carroll | 6 | 5.0% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cecil | 4 | 3.3% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Charles | 1 | 0.8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dorchester | 7 | 5.8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | |
| Frederick | 33 | 27.3% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| Garrett | 1 | 0.8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Harford | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Howard | 7 | 5.8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kent | 1 | 0.8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Montgomery | 3 | 2.5% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prince George's | 4 | 3.3% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Queen Anne's | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Somerset | 2 | 1.7% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 5 | 4.1% | 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 |
| Washington | 2 | 1.7% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wicomico | 6 | 5.0% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 12 | 9.9% | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Unknown | 1 | 0.8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 121 | 100.0% | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 60.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 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% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 8.3% | 0.0% | |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 14.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 40.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 9.9% | 11.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 23.1% | 0.0% | |

*This table will be updated in FY2016 to reflect unavailable Health and Mental Hygiene data.

Hospitalization, Psychiatric

| 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 | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Anne Arundel | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Baltimore | 1 | 6.7% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Baltimore City | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Calvert | 1 | 6.7% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Caroline | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Carroll | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Cecil | 1 | 6.7% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Charles | 3 | 20.0% | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Dorchester | 1 | 6.7% | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Frederick | 2 | 13.3% | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| Garrett | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Harford | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Howard | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Kent | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Montgomery | 1 | 6.7% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Prince George's | 4 | 26.7% | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Queen Anne's | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Somerset | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| St. Mary's | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Talbot | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Washington | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Wicomico | 1 | 6.7% | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Worcester | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Out-of-State | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Grand Total | 15 | 100.0% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 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% | 0.0% |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 26.7% | 6.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.7% | 0.0% | 6.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.7% | 33.3% |

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 | 2 | 20.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Baltimore City | 3 | 30.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 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 | 2 | 20.0% | 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 | 0 |
| Howard | 1 | 10.0% | 0 | 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 |
| Kent | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Montgomery | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prince George's | 2 | 20.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 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 | 10 | 100.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 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% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 40.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 30.0% | 30.0% |

Unknown

| | | Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|----------|--------------|-----------|----------------|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|------------|-----------|---------|---------|--------|------|------------|-----------------|--------------|----------|------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| Home Jurisdiction of Children | # children from jurisdiction in placement | % of children Statewide in placements from jurisdiction | Allegany | Anne Arundel | Baltimore | Baltimore City | Calvert | Caroline | Carroll | Cecil | Charles | Dorchester | Frederick | Garrett | Harford | Howard | Kent | Montgomery | Prince George's | Queen Anne's | Somerset | St. Mary's | Talbot | Washington | Wicomico | Worcester | Out-of-State | Unknown |
| Allegany | 5 | 1.5% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Anne Arundel | 9 | 2.7% | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Baltimore | 20 | 6.1% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Baltimore City | 141 | 43.0% | 0 | 1 | 12 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 53 |
| Calvert | 5 | 1.5% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Caroline | 2 | 0.6% | 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 |
| Carroll | 5 | 1.5% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cecil | 8 | 2.4% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Charles | 8 | 2.4% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Dorchester | 5 | 1.5% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Frederick | 3 | 0.9% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Garrett | 5 | 1.5% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Harford | 19 | 5.8% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Howard | 2 | 0.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kent | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Montgomery | 22 | 6.7% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| Prince George's | 52 | 15.9% | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 6 |
| Queen Anne's | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Somerset | 2 | 0.6% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 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 | 11 | 3.4% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Wicomico | 2 | 0.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Worcester | 2 | 0.6% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 328 | 100.0 | 3 | 4 | 23 | 85 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 21 | 84 |
| % of children from jurisdiction | | | 40.0% | 33.3% | 20.0% | 44.7% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 60.0% | 62.5% | 25.0% | 20.0% | 33.3% | 80.0% | 36.8% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 31.8% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 81.8% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| % children Statewide in all | | | 0.9% | 1.2% | 7.0% | 25.9% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 2.1% | 1.5% | 0.9% | 0.3% | 0.9% | 1.2% | 3.0% | 1.2% | 0.0% | 3.4% | 12.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.3% | 4.0% | 0.9% | 0.0% | 6.4% | 25.6% |