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University/Agency Partnerships

Partnerships can come about through a number of different mechanisms – class action lawsuits, legislative requirements, desire to address data capacity and analytic needs, to evaluate programs, to address service delivery programs, to test innovative programs or develop the evidence to support existing programs, or through the vision of leaders.

- Universities bring additional resources and expertise to projects.
- Agencies often need to evaluate programs and can utilize the resources of Universities.
- Universities are well-suited to partner with agencies around educational needs of the workforce.
- Long-standing University/Agency partnerships can provide stability in times of structural, systemic or political transition.
Examples of our ongoing State-University Partnerships

Pregnancy Prevention among youth in Out of Home Care (partnership with DHS/SSA and DHS/FIA)
Evaluation of Family Centered Practice and Family Involvement Meetings (partnership with DHS/SSA)
Child Welfare Training Academy (partnership with DHS/SSA)
Life after Welfare Series (partnership with DHS/FIA)
Maryland Rise (partnership with DHS/FIA/CSA)
Home Visiting in Maryland (partnership with DHS/SSA)
Maryland Medicaid Redesign (partnership with DMH)
Psychotropic Medication Management (partnership with DHS and DMH)
Birth Match process (partnership with DHS and Vital Records)
LINKs (partnership with DJS and DHS)
MLDS Research branch (partnership with the MLDSC)
Child Welfare Accountability (partnership with DHS)
Juvenile Services Evaluation (partnership with JJ)
Maryland Department of Juvenile Services
Process Flowchart

1. Youth Offense or Behavior Requiring System Involvement
   - Regular Referral
   - Service Referrals
   - Outside of DJS
   - Family Referrals
   - School Referrals

2. Intake Interview using Risk Screen
   - Disapproved/Resolved
   - Referral
     - Pre-court Supervision
     - Formal

3. Adjudicatory Hearing
   - Found Delinquent
   - Found Not Delinquent

4. Dispositional Hearing
   - Social History Investigation
   - Risk & Needs Assessment

5. Treatment Service Plan (TSP)
   - Evidence Based Services (EBS) and Other In-Home Services
   - TSP Update & Supervisory Case Review Every 90 days
   - Need Reassessment Every Six Months

6. State's Attorney's Office
   - Petition
   - Deny

7. Detained
   - Detained Pending Next Court Hearing
   - Detention Pending Next Court Hearing

8. Court Appearance
   - Case Closed: Petition Dismissed/Detained
   - Court process for all youth
   - Referral to outside services
   - Case management tools/services
   - Exit System

9. Exit System
   - Oval: End point
   - Rectangle: Process
   - Diamond: Non-DJS decision point

10. Community Supervision: Probation/Affiance
11. Commitment to DJS & Pre-Private Out-of-Home Placement

12. TSP Update & Supervisory Case Review Every 90 days
13. Need Reassessment Every Six Months
14. Exit System

Key:
- Enter system
- Process for regular intake referral
- Referral involving detention request
- Court process for all youth
- Referral to outside services
- Case management tools/services
- Exit system

Note: Revisions 9/2016
Flow of FY 2019 Case Referrals

Juvenile Complaints 18,899

Authorized Formal Petitions 7,349
(38.9% of Juvenile Complaints)

Court Dispositions 6,486 (34.3% of Juvenile Complaints)

Probation Dispositions 1,904
(10.1% of Juvenile Complaints)

Committed Dispositions 727
(3.8% of Juvenile Complaints)
Maryland Juvenile Complaints

- Complaints referred to DJS Intake declined **61%** since 2009.
12-month Juvenile and/or Criminal Justice Recidivism Rates, FY 2013-2017 Releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rearrest</th>
<th>Reconviction</th>
<th>Reincarceration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY13 (N=1,530)</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14 (N=1,338)</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15 (N=1,142)</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16 (N=980)</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17 (N=870)</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our Work with DJS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How We Work with DJS</th>
<th>Areas of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research/evaluation</td>
<td>Case Management Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology system planning/development</td>
<td>◦ Intake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation TA/coordination</td>
<td>◦ Detention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>◦ Probation &amp; Aftercare Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant writing</td>
<td>Service Array</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning/Events</td>
<td>◦ Evidence-Based Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Gap Analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Program Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Quality Services Reform Initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maryland Comprehensive Assessment & Service Planning Initiative (MCASP)

Validation of Risk & Needs Assessments/Structured Decision Making

Treatment Service Planning analyses/revisions

Next steps:
- Matching youth to services based on risk/need profiles
- Enhance use of protective factors in case planning
- Enhance use of reassessment (practice and program evaluation)

![MCASP Assessment Risk Level for Probation Youth—New Adjudication/Conviction within 12 Months]
The Impact of a Graduated Response Approach for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System

Implementation – 1,983 youths starting/ending supervision with DJS from Nov. 2015 to Oct. 2017

Outcomes – Quasi-experimental design using propensity score matching; Treatment group = youth supervised with AIM in place, Comparison group = youth under supervision prior to AIM

55% of youth received an AIM response

Application of Incentives to Sanctions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes (selected)</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-AIM</td>
<td>AIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOP Filed</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed Res. Placement</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral to DJS/Arrest</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjudication/Conviction</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment/Incarceration</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EBP Implementation

Support statewide implementation of Multisystemic Therapy (MST) and Functional Family Therapy (FFT)

Use of data
- Continuous quality improvement (CQI) framework
- Link administrative data to assess longitudinal outcomes (DJS, DPSCS, DSS)

Next steps:
- Use data to inform referral protocols, “what works for whom”
- Family First Prevention Services Act
Maryland Child Welfare System is Jurisdictional
Decision Path through the Child Welfare System

- Report of Possible Child Maltreatment
  - Screening (SDM with sup. Approval)
  - Investigative Response (IR)
  - Alternative Response (ARR)
  - Social Services Investigation (Disposition)
  - Open a Case?
  - Yes
    - Provide Informal Serv.
    - Yes
      - Informal Services Provided
      - No further Response Required
    - No
      - Investigative Response (IR)
      - Transfer to IR?
        - Yes
          - Provide Services in Home
        - No
          - Investigative Response (IR)
  - Yes
    - No
    - Investigative Response (IR)

- (ER) Emergency Response

- (FM) Family Maintenance
  - Yes
    - Provide Services in Home
  - No
    - Case Closed

- (FR) Family Reunification
  - Yes
    - Post-perm Services?
      - Yes
        - Post-perm Services Provided
      - No
        - Reunification
        - Adoption
        - Relative Guardianship
        - Non-Relative Guardianship
  - No
    - Other Exits

FM, FR, and PP Services can be either voluntary or involuntary.

Symbols:
- Red = Family involvement Meetings (at entry, placement change, change in permanency status, annual when over 14, and at exit)
- MFAA = Maryland Family Risk Assessment
- MACE-C = Safety Assessment
- CAS = Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths Assessment
Screenings – CPS/Non-CPS/Informational

CPS Responses
Approx. 33,000 Children

Alternative Response
36%

Investigative Response
64%

Indicated Finding
32%

Unsubstan Finding
22%

Ruled Out
46%

In-Home Services
Approx. 16,000 new cases

Out of Home Services
Approx. 2,200 entries

* Data published in the legislatively mandated 2019 Child Welfare Performance Indicators Report
* Data published in the legislatively mandated 2019 Child Welfare Performance Indicators Report
Our Work with DHS

How We Work with DHS
Research/evaluation
Implementation TA/coordination
Training – both in-service and pre-service
Grant writing
Strategic planning/Events
Research
Management reporting

Example Areas of Work

Case Management Practices
♭ Family Involvement Meeting Evaluation
♭ Family Centered Practice Evaluation
♭ Efficiency and Effectiveness of CW Services

Administrative Data
♭ Work with legacy and MD CHESSIE systems
♭ Data linking and cross-over projects
♭ Development and management of outcome reports
Research Reports
The Cycle of Experiences in the Child Welfare System

- Children having to reengage with the child serving system because of ongoing safety needs.

- Working to help children and families achieve permanence in a timely manner.

- Foster care as a temporary setting engaging with the child and family for only as long as necessary.

- Shorter Lengths Of Stay

- Permanency Through Reunification, Adoption, or Guardianship

- Reentry into Care

- Substantiated Report of A/N

- Counterbalanced Indicators of System Performance

- Stability Of Care

- Visitation – neighborhood based placements

- Maintain Positive Attachments to Family, Friends, & Neighbors

- Use of Least Restrictive Form of Care

- Home-Based Services vs. Out-of-Home Care

- In-Home Services vs. Out-of-Home Services

- Diversions? CPS or Alternative Response?

- Kinship Placements
  - Foster homes
  - Group Homes
  - Residential Care
  - Hospitalizations...

- Matching children and Carers such that children have as few moves as possible.

University of North Carolina School of Social Work, Annie E. Casey Foundation Family to Family Initiative
The Cycle of Experiences in the Child Welfare System

- Reentry into Care
  - Permanency Through Reunification, Adoption, or Guardianship
  - Shorter Lengths Of Stay

- Counterbalanced Indicators of System Performance
  - Substantiated Report of A/N Home-Based Services vs. Out-of-Home Care
  - Use of Least Restrictive Form of Care

- Maintain Positive Attachments to Family, Friends, & Neighbors
- Stability Of Care
I want to share 4 issues surrounding reentry that we have been working on with our state partners...

What reentry looks like across different types of permanent exits
  ◦ Reunification
  ◦ Relative Guardianship
  ◦ Non-relative Guardianship

How risk factors impact reentry
  ◦ First child welfare experience vs having past child welfare experience
  ◦ Cumulative risk and its impact on reentry

Impact of Trial Home Visits on Reentry

How reentry is not a single system issue
Risk factors found to increase reentry

- Age (younger & school aged)
- Race (not in Maryland)
- Gender (not significant in most literature)
- Child Behavior an Issue *
- Special Health Needs
- Prior Child Welfare Experience *
- Prior Child Serving System experience
- Parental Substance Abuse

- Removed from a single parent household *
- Poverty (the proxy is usually Title IVe eligibility)
- Being part of a sibling group in care *
- Short lengths of stay in out of home care *
- Entering care due to Neglect
- Being placed in residential treatment *
- Court ordered return against agency recommendation

* Consistently found to be a significantly associated with reentry.
What reentry looks like across different types of permanent exits
How risk factors impact reentry

The reentry rate in 18 months differs dramatically between these two groups:
First entry group: 16%;
Prior experience group: 25%
Risks Include:
• Being removed from a single parent household
• Short Lengths of Stay
• Child Behavior an Issue
• Being part of a sibling group
• Having a Residential placement
• Prior child welfare experience
How reentry is not a single system issue
Logistic Regression results for re-removal to CW or juvenile services:

**Increased Odds of Reentry:**
- Age at exit – 12 to 13 years compared to 7 to 11 years (OR=1.59)
- Siblings in care at the same (OR=2.47³)
- Child Behavior a factor at removal (OR=1.75¹)
- Prior Child Welfare Removals (OR=1.79³)
- Having a Residential Treatment Placement (OR=1.79³)
- Having a prior juvenile justice complaint (OR=4.14³)
- Having a court ordered return home against agency recommendations (OR=1.92²)

**Decreased Odds of Reentry**
- Having a removal reason of neglect (OR=0.76²)
- Being in care for 18 or more months (OR=0.63¹)
- Having a caseworker visit after reunification (OR=0.98³)

Significance: ¹0.05 level; ²0.01 level; or ³0.001 level
Thank You!

Questions....