

# **Citizens Review Board For Children**



**FIRST QUARTER  
FISCAL YEAR 2020 REPORT  
(July 1st 2020 – September 30th 2020)**

## Table of Contents

<u>Our Mission Statement</u> .....	3
<u>Our Vision Statement</u> .....	3
<u>Discrimination Statement</u> .....	3
<u>Confidentiality</u> .....	3
<u>CRBC Acknowledgements</u> .....	4
<u>Introduction</u> .....	5
<u>Targeted Review Criterion</u> .....	6
<u>Permanency Plan Hierarchy</u> .....	7
<u>Family Centered Practice Model</u> .....	7
<u>1st Quarter 2020 Case Review Statistics</u> .....	8
<u>Gender Totals</u> .....	10
<u>Gender By Plan</u> .....	10
<u>Ethnicity Overall</u> .....	10
<u>Age Range by Permanency Plan</u> .....	10
<u>Jurisdictional Case Reviews</u> .....	11
<u>Allegany County</u> .....	11
<u>Anne Arundel County</u> .....	18
<u>Baltimore County</u> .....	25
<u>Cecil County</u> .....	32
<u>Charles County</u> .....	39
<u>Dorchester County</u> .....	45
<u>Frederick County</u> .....	52
<u>Harford County</u> .....	59
<u>Montgomery County</u> .....	66
<u>Prince George’s County</u> .....	73
<u>St. Mary’s County</u> .....	80
<u>Somerset County</u> .....	86
<u>Washington County</u> .....	92
<u>Baltimore City</u> .....	99
<u>Required Supporting Documentation</u> .....	107
<u>Recommendations to All LDSS</u> .....	107
<u>Independent Living</u> .....	107
<u>Permanent Connections</u> .....	107
<u>Adoption</u> .....	107
<u>CRBC Metrics</u> .....	108
<u>The State Board</u> ..	109
<u>CRBC Staff</u> .....	110
<u>References</u> .....	111

## **Our Mission Statement**

To conduct case reviews of children in out-of-home care, make timely individual case and systemic child welfare recommendations; and advocate for legislative and systematic child welfare improvements to promote safety and permanency.

## **Our Vision Statement**

We envision the protection of all children from abuse and neglect, only placing children in out-of-home care when necessary; and providing families with the help they need to stay intact; children will be safe in a permanent living arrangement.

## **Discrimination Statement**

The Citizens Review Board for Children (CRBC) renounces any policy or practice of discrimination on the basis of race, gender, national origin, ethnicity, religion, disability, or sexual orientation that is or would be applicable to its citizen reviewers or staff or to the children, families, and employees involved in the child welfare system (CRBC, 2013).

## **Confidentiality**

CRBC local board members are bound by strict confidentiality requirements. Under Article 88A, § 6, all records concerning out-of-home care are confidential and unauthorized disclosure is a criminal offense subject to a fine not exceeding \$500 or imprisonment not exceeding 90 days, or both. Each local board member shall be presented with the statutory language on confidentiality, including the penalty for breach thereof, and sign a confidentiality statement prior to having access to any confidential information.

## **CRBC Acknowledgements**


CRBC would like to acknowledge the commitment, dedication, passion and service of all stakeholders on behalf of Maryland's most vulnerable children including:

- ★ CRBC Governor Appointed Volunteers
- ★ The Department of Human Services (DHS)
- ★ The Social Services Administration (SSA)
- ★ The Local Departments of Social Services (LDSS) and (DHHS) Montgomery County
- ★ The Coalition to Protect Maryland's Children(CPMC)
- ★ The State Council on Child Abuse and Neglect (SCCAN)
- ★ The State Child Fatality Review Team (SCFRT)
- ★ The Local Juvenile Courts of Maryland
- ★ All community partners

*Thank  
You*

## **Introduction**

The following pages contain data from CRBC's out-of-home-placement case review findings and recommendations for the 1st Quarter of Fiscal Year 2020.



CRBC conducts regular out-of-home placement case reviews in all 24 Maryland jurisdictions including Baltimore City throughout the year. For this quarterly report, the following counties did not have regularly scheduled case reviews during the quarter: Calvert, Caroline, Carroll, Garrett, Howard, Kent, Queen Anne's Talbot, Wicomico and Worcester counties. Therefore, this report only contains review findings and recommendations for the 14 jurisdictions including Baltimore City that had regularly scheduled reviews.

## **Targeted Review Criterion**

The Social Services Administration (SSA) and the Citizens Review Board for Children (CRBC) together have created a review work plan for targeted reviews of children in out-of-home-placement. This work plan contains targeted review criteria based on out- of-home-placement permanency plans.

### **Reunification:**

- ★ Already established plans of Reunification for youth 10 years of age and older. CRBC will conduct a review for a child 10 years of age and older who has an established primary permanency plan of Reunification, and has been in care 12 months or longer.

### **Adoption:**

- ★ Existing plans of Adoption. CRBC will conduct a review of a child that has had a plan of Adoption for over 12 months. The purpose of the review is to assess the appropriateness of the plan and identify barriers to achieve the plan.
- ★ Newly changed plans of Adoption. CRBC will conduct a review of a child within 5 months after the establishment of Adoption as a primary permanency plan. The purpose is to ensure that there is adequate and appropriate movement by the local departments to promote and achieve the Adoption.

### **Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA):**

- ★ Already established plans of APPLA for youth 16 years of age and younger. CRBC will conduct a full review of a child 16 years of age and younger who has an established primary permanency plan of APPLA. The primary purpose of the review is to assess appropriateness of the plan and review documentation of the Federal APPLA requirements.
- ★ Newly established plans of APPLA. CRBC will conduct a review of a child within 5 months after the establishment of APPLA as the primary permanency plan. Local Boards will review cases to ensure that local departments have made adequate and appropriate efforts to assess if a plan of APPLA was the most appropriate recourse for the child.

### **Older Youth Aging Out**

- ★ Older youth aging-out or remaining in out-of-home care at age 17 and 20 years old. CRBC will conduct reviews of youth that are 17 and 20 years of age. The primary purpose of the review is to assess if services were provided to prepare the youth to transition to adulthood.

### Re-Review Cases:

- ★ Assessment of progress made by LDSS. CRBC will conduct follow-up reviews during the fourth quarter of the current fiscal year of any cases wherein the Local Board identified barriers that may impede adequate progress. The purpose of the review is to assess the status of the child and any progress made by LDSS to determine if identified barriers have been removed.

### **Permanency Plan Hierarchy**

In 2005, Maryland House Bill 771 adjusted the state permanency goals to align with the federal standards. The permanency plan hierarchy in Maryland is as follows: (Social Services Administration, 2012):

- Reunification with parent(s) or guardian
- Placement with a relative for adoption or custody/guardianship
- Adoption by a non-relative
- Custody/Guardianship with a non relative
- Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)

### **Family Centered Practice Model**

According to the Social Services Administration, Family Centered Practice assures that the entire system of care engages the family in helping them to improve their ability to adequately plan for the care and safety of their children. The safety, well-being and permanence of children are paramount. The strengths of the entire family are the focus of the engagement (2010).

## 1st Quarter 2020 Case Review Statistics

The following table shows the jurisdictions where reviews were conducted, the total number of children reviewed, permanency plans and the number of boards held.

Jurn #	County	Reunification	Relative Placement	Adoption	Custody Guardianship	APPLA	TOTAL	# Boards Held
01	Allegany	2	1	3	0	1	7	1
02	Anne Arundel	5	0	5	1	3	14	2
03	Baltimore County	20	1	6	1	13	41	6
07	Cecil	7	2	6	1	0	16	2
08	Charles	1	0	0	5	2	8	1
09	Dorchester	0	0	1	1	5	7	1
10	Frederick	4	1	4	3	3	15	2
12	Harford	11	0	4	1	8	24	3
15	Montgomery	9	3	9	2	7	30	4
16	Prince George's	12	0	5	0	9	26	4
18	St. Mary's	3	2	1	2	0	8	1
19	Somerset	1	0	1	0	1	3	1
21	Washington	10	0	3	0	3	16	2
49	Baltimore City	25	6	5	11	34	81	12
14	<b>Statewide Totals</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>16*</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>42</b>
	<b>Percentages</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

\*(Note: Relative Placement is the combined total of Relative Placement for Adoption = 5; Relative Placement for Custody/Guardianship =11)

CRBC conducted a total of 296 individual out-of-home case reviews (each case reviewed represents 1 child/youth) in 14 Jurisdictions on 42 boards that held reviews during the 1st quarter of fiscal year 2020.

Although CRBC collects data on a number of data elements, this report will focus on the following:

- Permanency Plan - (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (E))
- Placement Plan - (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (I))
- Progress towards Permanent Placement - (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (F))
- Case Planning
- Health/Mental Health (family article 5-545)
- Education (family article 5-545)
- Ready by 21
- Independent Living Skills (14 and older)
- Employment (14 and older)
- Housing (Transitioning Youth age 20 and/or planning to discharge within a year from the time of the review)
- Permanent Connections
- Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)
- Pre-Adoption Services

- Post-Adoption Services
- Child's Visits with Parents, Relatives and Siblings
- Miscellaneous Findings
- Barriers/Issues to Permanency

**Total Reviewed (296)**

**Gender Totals**

Male	Female
153 (52%)	143 (48%)

**Gender by Plan**

Male(153)

Reunification	Relative Placement	Adoption	Custody Guardianship	APPLA
59 (38%)	11 (7%)	29 (19%)	18 (12%)	36 (24%)

Female(143)

Reunification	Relative Placement	Adoption	Custody Guardianship	APPLA
51 (35%)	5 (4%)	24 (17%)	10 (7%)	53 (37%)

**Ethnicity Overall**

African American	Caucasian	Other
181 (61%)	91 (31%)	24 (8%)

**Age Range by Permanency Plan**

[RU] = Reunification                      [RA]= Relative Adoption                      [RG] = Relative C & G  
 [AD] = Non Relative Adoption                      [CG] = Non Relative C & G                      [AP] = Appla

AGE RANGE	RU	RA	RG	AD	CG	AP	Totals
1_age 0 thru 5	11	4	1	29	4		49
2_age 6 thru 10	13	1	1	10	5		30
3_age 11 thru 13	34	0	2	7	8		51
4_age 14 thru 16	39	0	5	4	7	4	59
5_age 17 thru 19	11	0	2	2	4	56	75
6_age 20	2	0	0	1	0	29	32
<b>Totals</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>296</b>

## Jurisdictional Case Reviews

### Allegany County



Allegany County had a total of 7 cases that were reviewed with the following permanency plans:

- Reunification: 2 cases
- Relative Placement for Custody/Guardianship: 1 case
- Non Relative Adoption: 3 cases
- APPLA: 1 case

#### Permanency

The local board agreed with the department's permanency plan for all 7 cases reviewed.

The local juvenile court identified concurrent permanency plans for 2 cases.

The local department was implementing the concurrent permanency plans set by the court for the 2 cases.

#### Category of APPLA plan (1 case)

- Transition to an adult supportive living arrangement (1)

#### Permanent Connections (APPLA – 1 case)

The 1 APPLA case had a permanent connection identified and the local board agreed that the connection was appropriate for the case.

#### Length of time Child/Youth had a Permanency Plan

LENGTH	Reunif	Relative for Adoption	Relative for C & G	Non-Rel Adoption	Non-Rel Cust/Guad	APPLA
0 to 6 months				2		1
7 to 11 months						
1 to 2 years	1		1	1		

2 to 3 years						
3 years or more	1					
<b>Totals →</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>1</b>

Case Planning

Family Involvement Meetings (prior to entry): The local department held family involvement meetings prior to entry for 6 of the 7 cases reviewed.

Service Agreements: The local department had a signed service agreement for 4 of the 7 cases. 1 case was a post TPR child under the age of 14. Efforts to involve the family in the service agreement process were made for the 4 cases.

The local board agreed that the service agreements were appropriate for the 4 signed cases.

Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)

Number of Cases	Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)
1	Pre-Finalized Adoptive Home
1	Regular Foster Care
2	Treatment Foster Care
3	Residential Treatment Center

In 4 of the 7 cases reviewed the children/youths were placed in their home jurisdiction in settings that were in close proximity to their communities which allowed for the continuity of services.

The local board agreed with the department’s placement plan for all 7 cases reviewed.

Placement Stability

In 2 of the 7 cases reviewed there was a placement change within the 12 months prior to the review. Both cases had 2 placement changes.

The local department held a family involvement meeting for the placement changes for both cases.

The following levels of care were found for the 2 most recent placement changes:

- 1 case(s) was a less restrictive placement
- 1 case(s) was a more restrictive placement

Child/youth specific issues for the most recent placement changes included:

- 2 case(s) were behavioral issues

Were adequate services provided to support the provider in the previous placement:

- Yes, for both cases

Current placement match between child's needs and the provider's ability to meet those needs:

- Yes, for both cases

### Health/Mental Health

- Developmental/Special Needs: The local department reported that 3 of the 7 children/youths reviewed had developmental or special needs.
- Current Physical: All 7 children/youths had a current physical exam.
- Current Vision: All 7 children/youths had a current vision exam.
- Current Dental: 6 children/youths had a current dental exam.
- Follow-up Health Concerns: The local departments ensured that appropriate follow-ups occurred on all health concerns noted by a physician for the 2 children/youths requiring follow-ups.
- Completed Medical Records: The local departments reported that 5 of the 7 children/youths had completed medical records in their case files.
- Prescription Medication: 5 children/youths were taking prescription medication.
- Prescription Medication Monitored: Prescription medication was being monitored regularly for the 5 children/youths.
- Psychotropic Medication: 4 children/youths were taking psychotropic medication.
- Psychotropic Medication Monitored: Psychotropic medication was being monitored at least quarterly for the 4 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues: 4 children/youths had mental health issues.
- Mental Health Diagnosis: 4 children/youths had a mental health diagnosis.
- Mental Health Issues Addressed: Yes, for the 4 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues/Transitioning/Services: Not applicable, none of the 4 children/youths with mental health issues were transitioning out of care.
- Substance Abuse: None of the 7 children/youths had a substance abuse problem.
- Substance Abuse Addressed: Not applicable.
- Behavioral Issues: 4 children/youths had behavioral issues.

- Behavioral Issues Addressed: Yes, for the 4 children/youths.

The local board found that the health needs of 6 of the 7 children/youths had been met.

### Education

4 of the 7 children/youths reviewed were enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program. All 4 were in Pre-K through 12 grade. 1 of the 3 youths not enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had already graduated high school and 2 were under the age of 5.

All 4 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had a 504 or IEP plan and all 4 had a copy of the 504/IEP plan in the child/youth's record.

A current progress report/report card was not available for review for the 4 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program.

The local board agreed that 3 of the 4 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were being appropriately prepared to meet educational goals.

### Ready By 21

- Employment (age 14 and older – 2 cases)

None of the 2 youths were employed or participating in paid or unpaid work experience. Both youths were unable to work due to mental health reasons.

- Independent Living Services (age 14 and older – 2 cases)

None of the 2 youths were receiving appropriate services to prepare for independent living due to mental health reasons.

- Housing (Transitioning Youth – None)

(Age 20 and/or planning to discharge within a year from the review)

Not applicable.

### Child's Consent to Adoption

The age of consent for adoption in the State of Maryland is 10. Children 10 and older must consent to be adopted. 1 of the 3 children/youths with a plan of adoption did not want to be adopted and 2 were under the age of consent.

### Adoptive Placement Services and Resources (3 cases)

### Pre-Adoptive Placement (3 cases)

2 of the 3 children/youths with an adoption plan were placed in pre-adoptive homes. The pre-adoptive family structure was comprised of a married couple for 1 case and a single female for the other case. The relationship to the pre-adoptive children/youths was non relative foster parents in both cases.

Length of time in the pre-adoptive placements were as follows:

- 1 case(s) from 10 to 12 months
- 1 case(s) from 12 to 15 months

A home study was completed and approved for 1 of the 2 cases.

The local board agreed that appropriate services and supports were in place for the pre-adoptive families to meet the identified needs of the children/youths for both cases.

The local board agreed that the pre-adoptive placements were appropriate for both cases.

### Adoptive Recruitment (None)

Not Applicable. 1 child/youths did not want to be adopted.

### Post-Adoptive Services and Resources (2 cases)

Post-adoptive services were needed for 1 of the 2 adoption cases. The services that were needed was medical.

The local board agreed that the post-adoptive services and resources were appropriate for the case.

### Miscellaneous Findings

#### Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

2 of the 7 cases had a CASA.

#### Risk and Safety

The local board agreed that safety and risk protocols were followed for all 7 cases.

#### Child Visits with Parents, Relatives and Siblings

Child Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	5	1
No	2	6

Frequency of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
---------------------	--------------	----------------

Daily		
Once a week	3	
More than once a week	1	
Once a month	1	
More than once a month		1
Quarterly		
Yes, but undocumented		

Supervision of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Supervised	5	1
Unsupervised		

Who Supervises Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
LDSS Agency Representative	3	
Other Agency Representative		
Biological Family Member		
Foster Parent	2	
Other		1

Where do Visits Occur ?	With Parents	With Relatives
Parent/Relative Home		
LDSS Visitation Center		
Public Area	1	
Child's/Youth's Placement	4	1
Other		

Overnight Stays	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes		
No	5	1

The local board found that none of the 7 children/youths had siblings in care.

### Barriers/Issues

The local board identified the following barriers to permanency or issues:

- Youth placed outside of home jurisdiction.
- Child has behavior problems in the home.

## Summary

Based on the findings of the review the local board determined that the local Department of Social Services made adequate progress towards a permanent placement (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (F)) for all 7 children/youths reviewed.

## Anne Arundel County



Anne Arundel County had a total of 14 cases that were reviewed with the following permanency plans:

- Reunification: 5 cases
- Non Relative Adoption: 5 cases
- Non Relative Custody/Guardianship: 1 case
- APPLA: 3 cases

### Permanency

The local board agreed with the department's permanency plan for all 14 cases reviewed.

The local juvenile court did not identify concurrent permanency plans for any of the 14 cases.

### Category of APPLA plan (3 cases)

- Emancipation/Independence (2)
- Transition to an adult supportive living arrangement (1)

### Permanent Connections (APPLA – 3 cases)

All 3 APPLA cases had a permanent connection identified and the local board agreed that the connections were appropriate for all 3 cases.

### Length of time Child/Youth had a Permanency Plan

LENGTH	Reunif	Relative for Adoption	Relative for C & G	Non-Rel Adoption	Non-Rel Cust/Guad	APPLA
0 to 6 months				4		
7 to 11 months						
1 to 2 years	4			1	1	2
2 to 3 years	1					
3 years or more						1
<b>Totals →</b>	<b>5</b>			<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>

## Case Planning

Family Involvement Meetings (prior to entry): The local department held family involvement meetings prior to entry for 12 of the 14 cases reviewed.

Service Agreements: The local department had a signed service agreement for 6 of the 14 cases. Efforts to involve the family in the service agreement process were made for 12 cases.

The local board agreed that the service agreements were appropriate for the 6 signed cases.

## Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)

Number of Cases	Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)
5	Pre-Finalized Adoption
1	Regular Foster Care
2	Treatment Foster Care (Private)
2	Therapeutic Group Home
4	Residential Treatment Center

In 7 of the 14 cases reviewed the children/youths were placed in their home jurisdiction in settings that were in close proximity to their communities which allowed for the continuity of services.

The local board agreed with the department's placement plan for all 14 cases reviewed.

## Placement Stability

In 5 of the 14 cases reviewed there was a placement change within the 12 months prior to the review. 4 cases had 2 placement changes and 1 case had 4 or more changes.

The local department held a family involvement meeting for the placement changes for all 5 cases.

The following levels of care were found for the 5 most recent placement changes:

- 2 case(s) were less restrictive placements
- 2 case(s) were more restrictive placements
- 1 case(s) had the same level of care

The primary positive reason for the most recent placement changes:

- 1 case(s) was transitioning towards permanency goal

Provider specific issues for the most recent placement changes included:

- 1 case(s) incompatible match

Child/youth specific issues for the most recent placement changes included:

- 2 case(s) had behavioral issues

Were adequate services provided to support the provider in the previous placement:

- Yes, for all 5 cases

Current placement match between child's needs and the provider's ability to meet those needs:

- Yes, for all 5 cases

### Health/Mental Health

- Developmental/Special Needs: The local department reported that 3 of the 14 children/youths reviewed had developmental or special needs.
- Current Physical: 11 children/youths had a current physical exam.
- Current Vision: 8 children/youths had a current vision exam.
- Current Dental: 12 children/youths had a current dental exam.
- Follow-up Health Concerns: The local department ensured that appropriate follow-ups occurred on all health concerns noted by a physician for 1 of the 4 children/youth requiring follow-ups.
- Completed Medical Records: The local departments reported that 6 of the 14 children/youths had completed medical records in their case files.
- Prescription Medication: 8 children/youths were taking prescription medication.
- Prescription Medication Monitored: Prescription medication was being monitored regularly for the 8 children/youths.
- Psychotropic Medication: 7 children/youths were taking psychotropic medication.
- Psychotropic Medication Monitored: Psychotropic medication was being monitored at least quarterly for the 7 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues: 8 children/youths had mental health issues.
- Mental Health Diagnosis: 8 children/youths had a mental health diagnosis.
- Mental Health Issues Addressed: Yes, for 7 of the 8 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues/Transitioning/Services: Not applicable, none of the 8 children/youths with mental health issues were transitioning out of care.

- Substance Abuse: None of the 14 children/youths had a substance abuse problem.
- Substance Abuse Addressed: Not applicable.
- Behavioral Issues: 7 children/youths had behavioral issues.
- Behavioral Issues Addressed: Yes, for the 7 children/youths.

The local board found that the health needs of 5 of the 14 children/youths had been met.

### Education

10 of the 14 children/youths reviewed were enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program. All 10 were in Pre-K through 12 grade. 1 of the 4 youths not enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had already graduated high school and 3 were under the age of 5.

9 of the 10 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had a 504 or IEP plan and 8 had a copy of the 504/IEP plan in the child/youth's record.

A current progress report/report card was available for review for 8 of the 10 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program.

The local board agreed that all 10 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were being appropriately prepared to meet educational goals.

### Ready By 21

#### ➤ Employment (age 14 and older – 7 cases)

2 of the 7 youths were employed or participating in paid or unpaid work experience. 1 youth was unable to participate due to being medically fragile and 1 youth due to mental health reasons.

The local board agreed that the 2 youths were being appropriately prepared to meet employment goals.

#### ➤ Independent Living Services (age 14 and older – 7 cases)

The local board agreed that 5 youths were receiving appropriate services to prepare for independent living. 1 youth was not receiving appropriate services due being medically fragile and 1 youth due mental health reasons.

#### ➤ Housing (Transitioning Youth – None)

(Age 20 and/or planning to discharge within a year from the review)

Not applicable.

### Child's Consent to Adoption

The age of consent for adoption in the State of Maryland is 10. Children 10 and older must consent to be adopted. All 5 children with a plan of adoption were all under the age of consent.

### Adoptive Placement Services and Resources (5 cases)

#### Pre-Adoptive Placement (5 cases)

All 5 children/youths with an adoption plan were placed in pre-adoptive homes. The pre-adoptive family structure comprised of a married couple for 1 case and a single female for each of the 4 other children/youths. The relationship to the pre-adoptive children/youths was a non relative foster parent for all 5 cases.

Length of time in the pre-adoptive placements were as follows:

- 2 case(s) from 10 to 12 months
- 1 case(s) from 16 to 20 months
- 2 case(s) from 21 months or more

A home study was completed and approved for all 5 cases.

The local board agreed that appropriate services and supports were in place for the pre-adoptive families to meet the identified needs of the children/youths for all 5 cases.

The local board agreed that the pre-adoptive placements were appropriate for the 3 cases.

### Adoptive Recruitment (None)

Not applicable. All 5 children/youths were already placed in pre-adoptive homes.

### Post-Adoptive Services and Resources (5 cases)

Post-adoptive services were needed for all 5 adoption cases. The service that was needed was medical for all 5 cases.

The local board agreed that the post-adoptive services and resources were appropriate for all 5 cases.

### Miscellaneous Findings

#### Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

10 of the 14 cases had a CASA.

## Risk and Safety

The local board agreed that safety and risk protocols were followed for all 14 cases.

### Child Visits with Parents, Relatives and Siblings

Child Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	12	9
No	2	5

Frequency of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Daily		
Once a week	5	2
More than once a week		
Once a month	5	4
More than once a month	1	1
Quarterly		
Yes, but undocumented	1	2

Supervision of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Supervised	8	6
Unsupervised	4	3

Who Supervises Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
LDSS Agency Representative	7	5
Other Agency Representative		
Biological Family Member		
Foster Parent		
Other	1	1

Where do Visits Occur ?	With Parents	With Relatives
Parent/Relative Home		1
LDSS Visitation Center	4	4
Public Area	3	2
Child's/Youth's Placement	4	2
Other	1	

Overnight Stays	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	2	1
No	10	8

The local board found that 2 of the 14 children/youths had siblings in care. 1 had 2 siblings and the other had 3.

### Barriers/Issues

The local board identified the following barriers to permanency or issues:

- No service agreement with parents.
- No service agreement with youth.
- Annual physicals not current.
- Dentals not current.
- Vision not current.
- Other child/youth related barrier.
- Other independence barrier.
- Appeal by birth parents.
- No follow up on medical referrals.
- Youth non-compliant with medication.

### Summary

Based on the findings of the review the local board determined that the local Department of Social Services made adequate progress towards a permanent placement (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (F)) for 13 of the 14 children/youths reviewed.

## **Baltimore County**



Baltimore County had a total of 41 cases that were reviewed with the following permanency plans:

- Reunification: 20 cases
- Relative Placement for Custody/Guardianship: 1 case
- Non Relative Adoption: 6 cases
- Non Relative Custody/Guardianship: 1 case
- APPLA: 13 cases

### Permanency

The local board agreed with the department's permanency plan for 34 of the 41 cases reviewed.

The local juvenile court identified a concurrent permanency plan for 12 cases.

The local department was implementing the concurrent permanency plans set by the court for all 12 cases.

### Category of APPLA plan (13 cases)

- Emancipation/Independence (11)
- Transition to an adult supportive living arrangement (2)

### Permanent Connections (APPLA – 13 cases)

11 of the 13 APPLA cases had a permanent connection identified and the local board agreed that the connections were appropriate for the 11 cases.

### Length of time Child/Youth had a Permanency Plan

LENGTH	Reunif	Relative for Adoption	Relative for C & G	Non-Rel Adoption	Non-Rel Cust/Guad	APPLA
0 to 6 months	7		1	5	1	10
7 to 11 months	2					
1 to 2 years	10					2
2 to 3 years	1			1		
3 years or more						1

Totals →	20		1	6	1	13
----------	----	--	---	---	---	----

Case Planning

Family Involvement Meetings (prior to entry): The local department held family involvement meetings prior to entry for 34 of the 41 cases reviewed.

Service Agreements: The local department had a signed service agreement for 7 of the 41 cases. 4 cases were Post-TPR children under the age of 14. Efforts to involve the family in the service agreement process were made for 16 of the 37 eligible cases.

The local board agreed that the service agreements were appropriate for the 7 signed cases.

Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)

Number of Cases	Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)
2	Formal Kinship Care
5	Pre-Finalized Adoption
3	Restricted Relative Foster Care
7	Treatment Foster Care
5	Treatment Foster Care (Private)
4	Residential Group Home
4	Therapeutic Group Home
3	Independent Residential Living Program
3	Residential Treatment Center
1	Non Relative
1	Fictive Kin
1	Own Home/Apartment (LA)
1	Runaway (LA)
1	Secure Detention Facility (LA)

In 23 of the 41 cases reviewed the children/youths were placed in their home jurisdiction in settings that were in close proximity to their communities which allowed for the continuity of services.

The local board agreed with the department’s placement plan for 40 of the 41 cases reviewed.

Placement Stability

In 16 of the 41 cases reviewed there was a placement change within the 12 months prior to the review. 6 cases had 1 placement change, 4 had 2 changes, 3 had 3 changes and 3 had 4 or more changes.

The local department held a family involvement meeting for the placement changes for 12 of the 16 cases.

The following levels of care were found for the 16 most recent placement changes:

- 7 case(s) were less restrictive placements
- 5 case(s) were more restrictive placements
- 3 case(s) had the same level of care

The primary positive reason for the most recent placement changes:

- 3 case(s) were transitioning towards permanency goal
- 2 case(s) were placement with relatives

Provider specific issues for the most recent placement changes included:

- 3 case(s) provider home closed
- 1 case(s) incompatible match

Child/youth specific issues for the most recent placement changes included:

- 8 case(s) had behavioral issues

Were adequate services provided to support the provider in the previous placements?

- Yes, for all 16 cases

Current placement match between child's needs and the provider's ability to meet those needs:

- Yes, for 15 cases

### Health/Mental Health

- Developmental/Special Needs: The local department reported that 13 of the 41 children/youths reviewed had developmental or special needs.
- Current Physical: 28 children/youths had a current physical exam.
- Current Vision: 23 children/youths had a current vision exam.
- Current Dental: 27 children/youths had a current dental exam.
- Follow-up Health Concerns: The local department ensured that appropriate follow-ups occurred on all health concerns noted by a physician for 4 of the 7 children/youths requiring follow-ups.
- Completed Medical Records: The local departments reported that 20 of the 41 children/youths had completed medical records in their case files.
- Prescription Medication: 19 children/youths were taking prescription medication.

- Prescription Medication Monitored: Prescription medication was being monitored regularly for the 19 children/youths.
- Psychotropic Medication: 14 children/youths were taking psychotropic medication.
- Psychotropic Medication Monitored: Psychotropic medication was being monitored at least quarterly for the 14 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues: 27 children/youths had mental health issues.
- Mental Health Diagnosis: 27 children/youths had a mental health diagnosis.
- Mental Health Issues Addressed: Yes, for 19 of the 27 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues/Transitioning/Services: 1 youth with mental health issues who was transitioning out of care had an identified plan to receive services in the adult mental health system and 4 youths did not have a plan.
- Substance Abuse: 12 children/youths had a substance abuse problem.
- Substance Abuse Addressed: Yes, for 4 of the 12 children/youths.
- Behavioral Issues: 20 children/youths had behavioral issues.
- Behavioral Issues Addressed: Yes, for 17 of the 20 children/youths.

The local board found that the health needs of 21 of the 41 children/youths had been met and 1 child/youth refused to comply with standard health exams.

### Education

28 of the 41 children/youths reviewed were enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program. 27 of the 28 were in Pre-K through 12 grade and 1 youth was in college. 7 of the 13 youths not enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had already graduated high school and 6 were under the age of 5.

14 of the 28 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had a 504 or IEP plan and 12 had a copy of the 504/IEP plan in the child/youth's record.

A current progress report/report card was available for review for 15 of the 28 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program.

The local board agreed that 27 of the 28 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were being appropriately prepared to meet educational goals.

## Ready By 21

### ➤ Employment (age 14 and older – 24 cases)

10 of the 24 youths were employed or participating in paid or unpaid work experience. 6 youths were unable to participate due to mental health reasons.

The local board agreed that 11 youths were being appropriately prepared to meet employment goals.

### ➤ Independent Living Services (age 14 and older – 24 cases)

The local board agreed that 14 youths were receiving appropriate services to prepare for independent living and 6 youths were not receiving appropriate services due to mental health reasons.

### ➤ Housing (Transitioning Youth – 7 cases)

(Age 20 and/or planning to discharge within a year from the review)

Housing had been specified for 4 of the 7 youths transitioning out of care.

The local board agreed that 4 youths were being appropriately prepared to transition out of care.

## Child's Consent to Adoption

The age of consent for adoption in the State of Maryland is 10. Children 10 and older must consent to be adopted. Of the 6 cases with a plan of adoption, 2 youths consented and 4 children were under the age of consent.

## Adoptive Placement Services and Resources (6 cases)

### Pre-Adoptive Placement (6 cases)

5 of the 6 children/youths with an adoption plan were placed in pre-adoptive homes. The pre-adoptive family structure was comprised of a married couple for 3 cases and a single female for 2 cases. The relationships to the pre-adoptive children/youths were non relative foster parents in all 5 cases.

Lengths of time in the pre-adoptive placements were as follows:

- 1 case(s) from 12 to 15 months
- 1 case(s) from 16 to 20 months
- 3 case(s) from 21 months or more

A home study was completed and approved for 4 of the 5 cases.

The local board agreed that appropriate services and supports were in place for the pre-adoptive

families to meet the identified needs of the children/youths in all 5 cases.

The local board agreed that the pre-adoptive placements were appropriate for all 5 cases.

#### Adoptive Recruitment (1 case)

The local board found that the local department did not have documented efforts to find an adoptive resource for the 1 child/youth not placed in a pre-adoptive home.

#### Post-Adoptive Services and Resources (6 cases)

Post adoptive services were needed for 5 of the 6 children/youths. The service that was needed was medical for all 5 cases.

The local board found that the post adoptive service was appropriate for the 5 cases.

#### Miscellaneous Findings

##### Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

9 of the 41 cases had a CASA.

##### Risk and Safety

The local board agreed that safety and risk protocols were followed for 40 of the 41 cases.

##### Child Visits with Parents, Relatives and Siblings

Child Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	16	10
No	25	31

Frequency of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Daily		
Once a week	3	2
More than once a week	3	
Once a month	1	5
More than once a month	4	
Quarterly	1	
Yes, but undocumented	4	3

Supervision of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Supervised	5	3

Unsupervised	11	7
--------------	----	---

Who Supervises Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
LDSS Agency Representative	1	1
Other Agency Representative		
Biological Family Member	2	1
Foster Parent	1	1
Other	1	

Where do Visits Occur ?	With Parents	With Relatives
Parent/Relative Home	8	6
LDSS Visitation Center		
Public Area	3	3
Child's/Youth's Placement	4	1
Other	1	

Overnight Stays	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	6	3
No	10	7

The local board found that 8 of the 41 children/youths had siblings in care. All 8 had 1 sibling in care.

### Barriers/Issues

The local board identified the following barriers to permanency or issues:

- No service agreement with parents.
- No service agreement with youth.
- Missing or lack of documentation.
- No current IEP.
- Annual physicals not current.
- Dentals not current.
- Vision not current.
- Youth placed outside of home jurisdiction.
- Youth engages in risky behavior.
- Issues related to substance abuse.

### Summary

Based on the findings of the review the local board determined that the local Department of Social Services made adequate progress towards a permanent placement (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (F)) for 35 of the 41 children/youths reviewed.

## Cecil County



Cecil County had a total of 16 cases that were reviewed with the following permanency plans:

- Reunification: 7 cases
- Relative Placement for Custody/Guardianship: 2 cases
- Non Relative Adoption: 6 cases
- Non Relative Custody/Guardianship: 1 case

### Permanency

The local board agreed with the department’s permanency plan for 10 of the 16 cases reviewed.

The local juvenile court identified a concurrent permanency plan for 14 cases.

The local department was implementing the concurrent plans set by the court for all 14 cases.

### Category of APPLA plan (none)

### Permanent Connections (APPLA – none)

### Length of time Child/Youth had a Permanency Plan

LENGTH	Reunif	Relative for Adoption	Relative for C & G	Non-Rel Adoption	Non-Rel Cust/Guad	APPLA
0 to 6 months	1		2	3		
7 to 11 months				2		
1 to 2 years	4			1		
2 to 3 years					1	
3 years or more	2					
<b>Totals →</b>	<b>7</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	

### Case Planning

Family Involvement Meetings (prior to entry): The local department held family involvement meetings prior to entry for 13 of the 16 cases reviewed.

Service Agreements: The local department had a signed service agreement for 12 of the 16 cases. 1 child was Post TPR under the age of 14. Efforts to involve the family in the service agreement process were made for 12 of the 15 eligible cases.

The local board agreed that the service agreements were appropriate for the 12 signed cases.

Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)

Number of Cases	Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)
1	Formal Kinship Care
2	Pre Finalized Adoptive Home
6	Regular Foster Care
3	Treatment Foster Care (Private)
1	Residential Group Home
1	Therapeutic Group Home
1	Residential Treatment Center
1	Trial Home Visit (LA)

In 8 of the 16 cases reviewed the children/youths were placed in their home jurisdiction in settings that were in close proximity to their communities which allowed for the continuity of services.

The local board agreed with the department’s placement plan for 15 of the 16 cases reviewed.

Placement Stability

In 7 of the 16 cases reviewed there was a placement change within the 12 months prior to the review. 5 cases had 1 placement change and 2 had 2 changes.

The local department held a family involvement meeting for the placement changes for 2 of the 7 cases.

The following levels of care were found for the 7 most recent placement changes:

- 3 case(s) were less restrictive placements
- 2 case(s) were more restrictive placements
- 2 case(s) had the same level of care

The primary positive reason for the most recent placement changes:

- 3 case(s) were transitioning towards permanency goal

Provider specific issues for the most recent placement changes were;

- 1 case(s) provider home closed

Child/youth specific reasons for the most recent placement changes:

- 2 case(s) were behavioral issues

Were adequate services provided to support the provider in the previous placements?

- Yes, for 6 of the 7 cases

Current placement match between child's needs and the provider's ability to meet those needs:

- Yes, for all 7 cases

### Health/Mental Health

- Developmental/Special Needs: The local department reported that 3 of the 16 children/youths reviewed had developmental or special needs.
- Current Physical: 15 children/youths had a current physical exam.
- Current Vision: 13 children/youths had a current vision exam.
- Current Dental: 11 children/youths had a current dental exam.
- Follow-up Health Concerns: The local department ensured that appropriate follow-ups occurred on all health concerns noted by a physician for 7 of the 8 children/youths requiring follow-ups.
- Completed Medical Records: The local departments reported that 12 of the 16 children/youths had completed medical records in their case files.
- Prescription Medication: 7 children/youths were taking prescription medication.
- Prescription Medication Monitored: Prescription medication was being monitored regularly for the 7 children/youths.
- Psychotropic Medication: 6 children/youths were taking psychotropic medication.
- Psychotropic Medication Monitored: Psychotropic medication was being monitored at least quarterly for the 6 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues: 9 children/youths had mental health issues.
- Mental Health Diagnosis: 9 children/youths had a mental health diagnosis.
- Mental Health Issues Addressed: Yes, for the 9 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues/Transitioning/Services: Not applicable, none of the 9 children/youths with mental health issues were transitioning out of care.

- Substance Abuse: None of the 16 children/youths had a substance abuse problem.
- Substance Abuse Addressed: Not applicable.
- Behavioral Issues: 8 children/youths had behavioral issues.
- Behavioral Issues Addressed: Yes, for the 8 children/youths.

The local board found that the health needs of 12 of the 16 children/youths had been met and 2 children/youths refused to comply with standard health exams

### Education

9 of the 16 children/youths reviewed were enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program. All 9 were in Pre-K through 12th grade. The 7 children not enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were all under the age of 5.

4 of the 9 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had a 504 or IEP plan and all 4 had a copy of the 504/IEP plan in the child/youth's record.

A current progress report/report card was available for review for 8 of the 9 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program.

The local board agreed that all 9 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were being appropriately prepared to meet educational goals.

### Ready By 21

- Employment (age 14 and older – 3 cases)

None of the 3 youths were employed or participating in paid or unpaid work experience.

- Independent Living Services (age 14 and older – 3 cases)

The local board agreed that the 3 youths were receiving appropriate services to prepare for independent living.

- Housing (Transitioning Youth – None)

(Age 20 and/or planning to discharge within a year from the review)

Not applicable.

### Child's Consent to Adoption

The age of consent for adoption in the State of Maryland is 10. Children 10 and older must consent to be adopted. Of the 6 cases with a plan of adoption, 1 child/youth did not want to be adopted and 5 were under the age of consent.

## Adoptive Placement Services and Resources (7 cases)

### Pre-Adoptive Placement (7 cases)

5 of the 6 children/youths with an adoption plan were placed in pre-adoptive homes. 2 children/youths with a concurrent plan of adoption were also in pre-adoptive homes. The pre-adoptive family structure was comprised of a married couple for 6 cases and an unmarried couple for 1 case. The relationship to the pre-adoptive children/youths were non relative foster parents for all 7 cases.

Lengths of time in the pre-adoptive placements were as follows:

- 1 case(s) from 1 to 3 months
- 1 case(s) from 4 to 6 months
- 4 case(s) from 12 to 15 months
- 1 case(s) from 16 to 20 months

A home study was completed and approved for all 7 cases.

The local board agreed that appropriate services and supports were in place for the pre-adoptive families to meet the identified needs of the children/youths in all 7 cases.

The local board agreed that the pre-adoptive placements were appropriate for all 7 cases.

### Adoptive Recruitment (1 case)

The local board found that the local department had documented efforts to find an adoptive resource for the 1 child/youth not placed in a pre-adoptive home. The adoptive resource was relatives and the child/youth was listed on Adopt-Us-Kids.

The local board agreed that the adoptive recruitment efforts were appropriate for the child/youth.

### Post-Adoptive Services and Resources (7 cases)

Post adoptive services were needed for all 7 cases. The services that were needed was medical for 6 cases, mental health for 1 case, educational and respite for 2 cases and DDA services for 1 case.

The local board found that the post adoptive services were appropriate for the 7 cases.

## Miscellaneous Findings

### Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

12 of the 16 cases had a CASA.

## Risk and Safety

The local board agreed that safety and risk protocols were followed for all 16 cases.

### Child Visits with Parents, Relatives and Siblings

Child Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	8	7
No	8	9

Frequency of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Daily		
Once a week	7	
More than once a week		3
Once a month		3
More than once a month	1	1
Quarterly		
Yes, but undocumented		

Supervision of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Supervised	7	3
Unsupervised	1	4

Who Supervises Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
LDSS Agency Representative	7	3
Other Agency Representative		
Biological Family Member		
Foster Parent		
Other		

Where do Visits Occur ?	With Parents	With Relatives
Parent/Relative Home	1	
LDSS Visitation Center	1	1
Public Area	6	3
Child's/Youth's Placement		3
Other		

Overnight Stays	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	1	1
No	7	6

The local board found that 12 of the 16 children/youths had siblings in care. 6 had 1 sibling and 6 had 2 siblings.

### Barriers/Issues

The local board identified the following barriers to permanency or issues:

- Board does not agree with current permanency plan.
- Missing or lack of documentation.
- Annual physicals not current.
- Dentals not current.
- Vision not current.
- Other independence barrier.
- Youth placed outside of home jurisdiction.

### Summary

Based on the findings of the review the local board determined that the local Department of Social Services made adequate progress towards a permanent placement (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (F)) for 12 of the 16 children/youths reviewed.

## Charles County



Charles County had a total of 8 cases that were reviewed with the following permanency plans:

- Reunification: 1 case
- Non Relative Custody/Guardianship: 5 cases
- APPLA: 2 cases

### Permanency

The local board agreed with the department's permanency plan for 7 of the 8 cases reviewed.

The local juvenile court identified a concurrent permanency plan for 5 cases.

The local department was implementing the concurrent plans set by the court for the 5 cases.

### Category of APPLA plan (2 cases)

- Emancipation/Independence (2)

### Permanent Connections (APPLA – 2 cases)

1 of the 2 APPLA cases had a permanent connection identified and the local board agreed that the connection was appropriate for the 1 case.

### Length of time Child/Youth had a Permanency Plan

LENGTH	Reunif	Relative for Adoption	Relative for C & G	Non-Rel Adoption	Non-Rel Cust/Guad	APPLA
0 to 6 months						2
7 to 11 months					5	
1 to 2 years						
2 to 3 years	1					
3 years or more						
<b>Totals →</b>	<b>1</b>				<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>

## Case Planning

Family Involvement Meetings (prior to entry): The local department held family involvement meetings prior to entry for all 8 cases reviewed.

Service Agreements: The local department had a signed service agreement for 1 of the 8 cases. Efforts to involve the family in the service agreement process were made for 1 case.

The local board agreed that the service agreement was appropriate for the 1 signed case.

## Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)

Number of Cases	Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)
2	Formal Kinship Care
3	Regular Foster Care
1	Treatment Foster Care
2	Residential Group Home

In all 8 cases reviewed the children/youths were placed in their home jurisdiction in settings that were in close proximity to their communities which allowed for the continuity of services.

The local board agreed with the department's placement plan for all 8 cases reviewed.

## Placement Stability

In 4 of the 8 cases reviewed there was a placement change within the 12 months prior to the review. 3 cases had 1 placement change and 1 had 2.

The local department held a family involvement meeting for the placement changes for the 4 cases.

The following levels of care were found for the 4 most recent placement changes:

- 1 case(s) was a less restrictive placement
- 1 case(s) was a more restrictive placement
- 2 case(s) had the same level of care

The primary positive reason for the most recent placement changes:

- 1 case(s) transitioning towards permanency goal

Provider specific issues for the most recent placement changes were;

- 2 case(s) incompatible match

Child/youth specific reasons for the most recent placement changes:

- 1 case(s) behavioral issues

Were adequate services provided to support the provider in the previous placements:

- Yes, for the 4 cases

Current placement match between child's needs and the provider's ability to meet those needs:

- Yes, for 3 of the 4 cases

### Health/Mental Health

- Developmental/Special Needs: The local department reported that 1 of the 8 children/youths reviewed had developmental or special needs.
- Current Physical: 7 children/youths had a current physical exam.
- Current Vision: 7 children/youths had a current vision exam.
- Current Dental: 7 children/youths had a current dental exam.
- Follow-up Health Concerns: The local department ensured that appropriate follow-ups occurred on all health concerns noted by a physician for all 3 children/youths requiring follow-ups.
- Completed Medical Records: The local departments reported that 7 of the 8 children/youths had completed medical records in their case files.
- Prescription Medication: 2 children/youths were taking prescription medication.
- Prescription Medication Monitored: Prescription medication was being monitored regularly for the 2 children/youths.
- Psychotropic Medication: 2 children/youths were taking psychotropic medication.
- Psychotropic Medication Monitored: Psychotropic medication was being monitored at least quarterly for the 2 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues: 2 children/youths had mental health issues.
- Mental Health Diagnosis: 2 children/youths had a mental health diagnosis.
- Mental Health Issues Addressed: Yes, for both children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues/Transitioning/Services: Not applicable, none of the 2 children/youths with mental health issues where transitioning out of care.

- Substance Abuse: 1 child/youth had a substance abuse problem.
- Substance Abuse Addressed: Yes, for the child/youth.
- Behavioral Issues: 2 children/youths had behavioral issues.
- Behavioral Issues Addressed: Yes, for both children/youths.

The local board found that the health needs of 7 of the 8 children/youths had been met and 1 child/youth refused to comply with standard health exams.

### Education

6 of the 8 children/youths reviewed were enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program. All 6 were in Pre-K through 12 grade. 2 children not enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were under the age of 5.

4 of the 6 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had a 504 or IEP plan and 4 had a copy of the 504/IEP plan in the child/youth's record.

A current progress report/report card was available for review for all 6 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program.

The local board agreed that all 6 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were being appropriately prepared to meet educational goals.

### Ready By 21

- Employment (age 14 and older – 3 cases)

All 3 youths were employed or participating in paid or unpaid work experience.

The local board agreed that the 3 youths were being appropriately prepared to meet employment goals.

- Independent Living Services (age 14 and older – 3 cases)

The local board agreed that the 3 youths were receiving appropriate services to prepare for independent living.

- Housing (Transitioning Youth – None)

(Age 20 and/or planning to discharge within a year from the review)

Not applicable.

Child's Consent to Adoption

Not applicable. None of the 8 children had a plan of adoption.

Adoptive Placement Services and Resources (none)

Pre-Adoptive Placement (none)

Not applicable. None of the 8 children had a plan of adoption.

Adoptive Recruitment (none)

Not applicable. None of the 8 children had a plan of adoption.

Post-Adoptive Services and Resources (none)

Not applicable. None of the 8 children had a plan of adoption.

Miscellaneous Findings

Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

None of the 8 cases had a CASA.

Risk and Safety

The local board agreed that safety and risk protocols were followed for all 8 cases.

Child Visits with Parents, Relatives and Siblings

Child Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	7	8
No	1	

Frequency of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Daily	1	4
Once a week	4	1
More than once a week		
Once a month	1	
More than once a month		
Quarterly		
Yes, but undocumented	1	3

Supervision of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Supervised	5	
Unsupervised	2	8

Who Supervises Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
LDSS Agency Representative	4	
Other Agency Representative		
Biological Family Member		
Foster Parent		
Other	1	

Where do Visits Occur ?	With Parents	With Relatives
Parent/Relative Home	1	7
LDSS Visitation Center		
Public Area	6	1
Child's/Youth's Placement		
Other		

Overnight Stays	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	1	7
No	6	1

The local board found that 5 of the 8 children/youths had siblings in care. All 5 had 4 siblings each.

### Barriers/Issues

The local board identified the following barriers to permanency or issues:

- No service agreement with parents.
- No service agreement with youth.
- Annual physicals not current.
- Dentals not current.
- Vision not current.

### Summary

Based on the findings of the review the local board determined that the local Department of Social Services made adequate progress towards a permanent placement (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (F)) for all 8 children/youths reviewed.

## Dorchester County



Dorchester County had a total of 7 cases that were reviewed with the following permanency plans:

- Non Relative Adoption: 1 case
- Non Relative Custody/Guardianship: 1 case
- APPLA: 5 cases

### Permanency

The local board agreed with the department’s permanency plan for all 7 cases reviewed.

The local juvenile court identified a concurrent permanency plan for 1 case.

The local department was implementing the concurrent plans set by the court for the 1 case.

### Category of APPLA plan (5 cases)

- Emancipation/Independence (4)
- Transition to an adult supportive living arrangement (1)

### Permanent Connections (APPLA – 5 cases)

All 5 APPLA cases had a permanent connection identified and the local board agreed that the connections were appropriate for all 5 cases.

### Length of time Child/Youth had a Permanency Plan

LENGTH	Reunif	Relative for Adoption	Relative for C & G	Non-Rel Adoption	Non-Rel Cust/Guad	APPLA
0 to 6 months						1
7 to 11 months					1	1
1 to 2 years						1
2 to 3 years				1		1
3 years or more						1
<b>Totals →</b>				<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>

## Case Planning

Family Involvement Meetings (prior to entry): The local department held family involvement meetings prior to entry for 6 of the 7 cases reviewed.

Service Agreements: The local department had a signed service agreement for 6 of the 7 cases. 1 child was Post TPR under the age of 14. Efforts to involve the family in the service agreement process were made for the 6 eligible cases.

The local board agreed that the service agreements were appropriate for the 6 signed cases.

## Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)

Number of Cases	Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)
3	Treatment Foster Care (Private)
1	Residential Group Home
1	Independent Living Program
1	Inpatient Psychiatric Care (LA)
1	Unapproved Living Arrangement (LA)

In 3 of the 7 cases reviewed the children/youths were placed in their home jurisdiction in settings that were in close proximity to their communities which allowed for the continuity of services.

The local board agreed with the department's placement plan for 6 of the 7 cases reviewed.

## Placement Stability

In 3 of the 7 cases reviewed there was a placement change within the 12 months prior to the review. 2 cases had 1 placement change and 1 had 2 changes.

The local department did not hold a family involvement meeting for the placement changes for none of the 3 cases.

The following levels of care were found for the 3 most recent placement changes:

- 1 case(s) was a less restrictive placement
- 1 case(s) was a more restrictive placement
- 1 case(s) was a runaway

The primary positive reason for the most recent placement changes:

- 1 case(s) was transitioning towards permanency goal

Child/youth specific reasons for the most recent placement changes:

- 1 case(s) runaway

- 1 case(s) hospitalization

Were adequate services provided to support the provider in the previous placements?

- Yes, for all 3 cases

Current placement match between child's needs and the provider's ability to meet those needs:

- Yes, for all 3 cases

### Health/Mental Health

- Developmental/Special Needs: The local department reported that 2 of the 7 children/youths reviewed had developmental or special needs.
- Current Physical: 6 children/youths had a current physical exam.
- Current Vision: 5 children/youths had a current vision exam.
- Current Dental: 6 children/youths had a current dental exam.
- Follow-up Health Concerns: The local department ensured that appropriate follow-ups occurred on all health concerns noted by a physician for all 3 children/youths requiring follow-ups.
- Completed Medical Records: The local departments reported that 4 of the 7 children/youths had completed medical records in their case files.
- Prescription Medication: 5 children/youths were taking prescription medication.
- Prescription Medication Monitored: Prescription medication was being monitored regularly for the 5 children/youths.
- Psychotropic Medication: 4 children/youths were taking psychotropic medication.
- Psychotropic Medication Monitored: Psychotropic medication was being monitored at least quarterly for the 4 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues: 6 children/youths had mental health issues.
- Mental Health Diagnosis: 6 children/youths had a mental health diagnosis.
- Mental Health Issues Addressed: Yes, for 5 of the 6 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues/Transitioning/Services: 1 youth with mental health issues who was transitioning out of care, had an identified plan to receive services in the adult mental health system.

- Substance Abuse: 1 youth had a substance abuse problem.
- Substance Abuse Addressed: No, for the 1 youth.
- Behavioral Issues: 5 children/youths had behavioral issues.
- Behavioral Issues Addressed: Yes, for 4 of the 5 children/youths.

The local board found that the health needs of 5 of the 7 children/youths had been met and 1 child/youth refused to comply with standard health exams

### Education

5 of the 7 children/youths reviewed were enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program. 3 of the 5 were in Pre-K through 12th grade and 2 youths were in college. 1 of the 2 youths not enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had already graduated high school and the other refused to attend school.

1 of the 5 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had a 504 or IEP plan and had a copy of the 504/IEP plan in the child/youth's record.

A current progress report/report card was available for review for 2 of the 5 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program.

The local board agreed that all 5 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were being appropriately prepared to meet educational goals.

### Ready By 21

#### ➤ Employment (age 14 and older – 7 cases)

3 of the 7 youths were employed or participating in paid or unpaid work experience and 1 was unable to participate due to mental health reasons.

The local board agreed that 5 youths were being appropriately prepared to meet employment goals.

#### ➤ Independent Living Services (age 14 and older – 7 cases)

The local board agreed that 5 youths were receiving appropriate services to prepare for independent living. 1 youth was not receiving appropriate services due to mental health reasons.

#### ➤ Housing (Transitioning Youth – 1 case)

(Age 20 and/or planning to discharge within a year from the review)

Housing had been specified for the youth transitioning out of care.

The local board agreed that the youth was being appropriately prepared to transition out of care.

#### Child's Consent to Adoption

The age of consent for adoption in the State of Maryland is 10. Children 10 and older must consent to be adopted. The 1 child/youth with a plan of adoption consented.

#### Adoptive Placement Services and Resources (1 case)

##### Pre-Adoptive Placement (1 case)

The 1 child/youth with a plan of adoption was not placed in a pre-adoptive placement.

##### Adoptive Recruitment (1 case)

The local board found that the local department had documented efforts to find an adoptive resource for the 1 child/youth not placed in a pre-adoptive home. The child/youth was listed on Adopt-Us-Kids.

The local board agreed that the adoptive recruitment efforts were appropriate for the child/youth.

##### Post-Adoptive Services and Resources (1 case)

Post adoptive services were needed for the 1 child/youth. The services that were needed were medical, mental health and educational.

The local board found that the post adoptive services were appropriate for the case.

#### Miscellaneous Findings

##### Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

All 7 cases had a CASA.

##### Risk and Safety

The local board agreed that safety and risk protocols were followed for 6 of the 7 cases.

### Child Visits with Parents, Relatives and Siblings

Child Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	4	3
No	3	4

Frequency of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Daily		
Once a week		
More than once a week		
Once a month	1	1
More than once a month	3	2
Quarterly		
Yes, but undocumented		

Supervision of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Supervised	1	
Unsupervised	3	3

Who Supervises Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
LDSS Agency Representative		
Other Agency Representative		
Biological Family Member		
Foster Parent	1	
Other		

Where do Visits Occur ?	With Parents	With Relatives
Parent/Relative Home	1	3
LDSS Visitation Center		
Public Area	1	
Child's/Youth's Placement	2	
Other		

Overnight Stays	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	1	2
No	3	1

The local board found that 3 of the 4 children/youths had siblings in care. All 3 had 1 sibling in care.

## Barriers/Issues


The local board identified the following barriers to permanency or issues:

- Missing or lack of documentation.
- Annual physicals not current.
- Dentals not current.
- Vision not current.
- Other independence barrier.
- Youth placed outside of home jurisdiction.
- Child has behavior problems in the home.
- No current IEP.
- Youth not attending school or in GED program.
- Other education barrier.
- Youth refuses mental health treatment including therapy.
- Youth non-compliant with medication.
- Youth needs more restrictive placement.

## Summary

Based on the findings of the review the local board determined that the local Department of Social Services made adequate progress towards a permanent placement (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (F)) for all 7 children/youths reviewed.

## Frederick County



Frederick County had a total of 15 cases that were reviewed with the following permanency plans:

- Reunification: 4 cases
- Relative Placement for Custody/Guardianship: 1 case
- Non Relative Adoption: 4 cases
- Non Relative Custody/Guardianship: 3 cases
- APPLA: 3 cases

### Permanency

The local board agreed with the department’s permanency plan for 12 of the 15 cases reviewed.

The local juvenile court identified a concurrent permanency plan for 3 cases.

The local department was implementing the concurrent permanency plans set by the court for the 3 cases.

### Category of APPLA plan (3 cases)

- Emancipation/Independence (3)

### Permanent Connections (APPLA – 3 cases)

All 3 APPLA cases had a permanent connection identified and the local board agreed that the connections were appropriate for all 3 cases.

### Length of time Child/Youth had a Permanency Plan

LENGTH	Reunif	Relative for Adoption	Relative for C & G	Non-Rel Adoption	Non-Rel Cust/Guad	APPLA
0 to 6 months			1	2	2	1
7 to 11 months				2		
1 to 2 years	2				1	1
2 to 3 years						

3 years or more	2					1
<b>Totals →</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>

### Case Planning

Family Involvement Meetings (prior to entry): The local department held family involvement meetings prior to entry for 11 of the 15 cases reviewed.

Service Agreements: The local department had a signed service agreement for 11 of the 15 cases. 3 cases were Post-TPR children under the age of 14. Efforts to involve the family in the service agreement process were made for the 12 eligible cases.

The local board agreed that the service agreements were appropriate for 10 of the 11 signed cases.

### Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)

Number of Cases	Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)
3	Pre-Finalized Adoption
6	Regular Foster Care
1	Treatment Foster Care (Private)
1	Independent Living Program
1	Residential Treatment Center
1	Own Dwelling
1	College (LA)
1	Inpatient Psychiatric Care (LA)

In 10 of the 15 cases reviewed the children/youths were placed in their home jurisdiction in settings that were in close proximity to their communities which allowed for the continuity of services.

The local board agreed with the department's placement plan for all 15 cases reviewed.

### Placement Stability

In 8 of the 15 cases reviewed there was a placement change within the 12 months prior to the review. 6 cases had 1 placement change, 1 had 2 changes and 1 had 3 changes.

The local department did not hold a family involvement meeting for the placement changes for any of the 8 cases.

The following levels of care were found for the 8 most recent placement changes:

- 3 case(s) were less restrictive placements
- 2 case(s) were more restrictive placements
- 3 case(s) had the same level of care

The primary positive reason for the most recent placement changes:

- 4 case(s) were transitioning towards permanency goal
- 1 case(s) was placement with relatives

Child/youth specific issues for the most recent placement changes included:

- 2 case(s) had behavioral issues
- 1 case(s) hospitalization

Were adequate services provided to support the provider in the previous placements?

- Yes, for all 8 cases

Current placement match between child's needs and the provider's ability to meet those needs:

- Yes, for all 8 cases

#### Health/Mental Health

- Developmental/Special Needs: The local department reported that 4 of the 15 children/youths reviewed had developmental or special needs.
- Current Physical: 13 children/youths had a current physical exam.
- Current Vision: 9 children/youths had a current vision exam.
- Current Dental: 11 children/youths had a current dental exam.
- Follow-up Health Concerns: The local department ensured that appropriate follow-ups occurred on all health concerns noted by a physician for 2 of the 3 children/youths requiring follow-ups.
- Completed Medical Records: The local departments reported that 8 of the 15 children/youths had completed medical records in their case files.
- Prescription Medication: 9 children/youths were taking prescription medication.
- Prescription Medication Monitored: Prescription medication was being monitored regularly for the 9 children/youths.
- Psychotropic Medication: 7 children/youths were taking psychotropic medication.
- Psychotropic Medication Monitored: Psychotropic medication was being monitored at least quarterly for the 7 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues: 10 children/youths had mental health issues.
- Mental Health Diagnosis: 10 children/youths had a mental health diagnosis.

- Mental Health Issues Addressed: Yes, for 8 of the 10 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues/Transitioning/Services: Not applicable, none of the 10 children/youths with mental health issues were transitioning out of care.
- Substance Abuse: None of the 15 children/youths had a substance abuse problem.
- Substance Abuse Addressed: Not applicable.
- Behavioral Issues: 10 children/youths had behavioral issues.
- Behavioral Issues Addressed: Yes, for 9 of the 10 children/youths.

The local board found that the health needs of 8 of the 15 children/youths had been met.

### Education

11 of the 15 children/youths reviewed were enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program. 10 were in Pre-K through 12th grade and 1 was in college. 1 of the 4 youths not enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had already graduated high school and 3 were under the age of 5.

5 of the 11 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had a 504 or IEP plan and 4 had a copy of the 504/IEP plan in the child/youth's record.

A current progress report/report card was available for review for 8 of the 11 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program.

The local board agreed that all 11 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were being appropriately prepared to meet educational goals.

### Ready By 21

#### ➤ Employment (age 14 and older – 6 cases)

2 of the 6 youths were employed or participating in paid or unpaid work experience and 1 youth was unable to participate due to mental health issues.

The local board agreed that 4 youths were being appropriately prepared to meet employment goals.

#### ➤ Independent Living Services (age 14 and older – 6 cases)

The local board agreed that 5 youths were receiving appropriate services to prepare for independent living and 1 youth was not receiving appropriate services due to mental health reasons.

- Housing (Transitioning Youth – None)  
(Age 20 and/or planning to discharge within a year from the review)

Not applicable.

### Child's Consent to Adoption

The age of consent for adoption in the State of Maryland is 10. Children 10 and older must consent to be adopted. Of the 4 cases with a plan of adoption and the 1 case with a concurrent plan of adoption, 2 youths consented and 3 were under the age of consent.

### Adoptive Placement Services and Resources (5 cases)

#### Pre-Adoptive Placement (5 cases)

All 4 children/youths with an adoption plan and 1 with a concurrent plan of adoption were placed in a pre-adoptive home. The pre-adoptive family structure was comprised of a married couple for 3 cases and a single female for 2 cases. The relationships to the pre-adoptive children/youths were non relative foster parents for the 5 cases.

Lengths of time in the pre-adoptive placements were as follows:

- 1 case(s) from 4 to 6 months
- 2 case(s) from 10 to 12 months
- 2 case(s) from 21 months or more

A home study was completed and approved for all 5 cases.

The local board agreed that appropriate services and supports were in place for the pre-adoptive families to meet the identified needs of the children/youths in the 5 cases.

The local board agreed that the pre-adoptive placements were appropriate for all 5 cases.

### Adoptive Recruitment (None)

Not applicable. All 5 children/youths were already placed in pre-adoptive homes.

### Post-Adoptive Services and Resources (5 cases)

Post adoptive services were needed for the 5 cases. The services that were needed were medical for all 5 cases, mental health services for 3 and educational services for 2 cases.

The local board found that the post adoptive services were appropriate for the 5 cases.

## Miscellaneous Findings

### Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

9 of the 15 cases had a CASA.

### Risk and Safety

The local board agreed that safety and risk protocols were followed for 11 of the 15 cases.

### Child Visits with Parents, Relatives and Siblings

Child Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	9	2
No	6	13

Frequency of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Daily		
Once a week	2	
More than once a week	3	1
Once a month		
More than once a month	3	1
Quarterly	1	
Yes, but undocumented		

Supervision of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Supervised	5	1
Unsupervised	4	1

Who Supervises Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
LDSS Agency Representative	4	1
Other Agency Representative	1	
Biological Family Member		
Foster Parent		
Other		

Where do Visits Occur ?	With Parents	With Relatives
Parent/Relative Home	2	1
LDSS Visitation Center	1	1
Public Area	5	
Child's/Youth's Placement	1	

Other		
-------	--	--

Overnight Stays	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	2	1
No	7	1

The local board found that 7 of the 15 children/youths had siblings in care. 4 had 1 sibling in care and 3 had 2.

Barriers/Issues

The local board identified the following barriers to permanency or issues:

- Youth placed outside of home jurisdiction.
- Missing or lack of documentation.
- Board does not agree with current permanency plan.
- Annual physicals not current.
- Dentals not current.
- Vision not current.
- No concurrent plan by court

Summary

Based on the findings of the review the local board determined that the local Department of Social Services made adequate progress towards a permanent placement (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (F)) for 14 of the 15 children/youths reviewed.

## Harford County



Harford County had a total of 24 cases that were reviewed with the following permanency plans:

- Reunification: 11 cases
- Non Relative Adoption: 4 cases
- Non Relative Custody/Guardianship: 1 case
- APPLA: 8 cases

### Permanency

The local board agreed with the department's permanency plan for 23 of the 24 cases reviewed.

The local juvenile court identified a concurrent permanency plan for 1 case.

The local department was not implementing the concurrent permanency plan set by the court for the 1 case.

### Category of APPLA plan (8 cases)

- Emancipation/Independence (8)

### Permanent Connections (APPLA – 8 cases)

All 8 APPLA cases had a permanent connection identified and the local board agreed that the connections were appropriate for all 8 cases.

### Length of time Child/Youth had a Permanency Plan

LENGTH	Reunif	Relative for Adoption	Relative for C & G	Non-Rel Adoption	Non-Rel Cust/Guad	APPLA
0 to 6 months				3	1	3
7 to 11 months	2					1
1 to 2 years	5					1
2 to 3 years	2			1		1
3 years or more	2					2
<b>Totals →</b>	<b>11</b>			<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>

## Case Planning

Family Involvement Meetings (prior to entry): The local department held family involvement meetings prior to entry for all 24 cases reviewed.

Service Agreements: The local department had a signed service agreement for 18 of the 24 cases. Efforts to involve the family in the service agreement process were made for 23 cases.

The local board agreed that the service agreements were appropriate for the 18 signed cases.

## Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)

Number of Cases	Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)
2	Formal Kinship Care
1	Pre-Finalized Adoption
4	Regular Foster Care
7	Treatment Foster Care (Private)
2	Residential Group Home
1	Therapeutic Group Home
1	Residential Treatment Center
3	Own Dwelling
3	Diagnostic Center

In 14 of the 24 cases reviewed the children/youths were placed in their home jurisdiction in settings that were in close proximity to their communities which allowed for the continuity of services.

The local board agreed with the department's placement plan for 23 of the 24 cases reviewed.

## Placement Stability

In 15 of the 24 cases reviewed there was a placement change within the 12 months prior to the review. 10 cases had 1 placement change, 4 had 2 changes and 1 had 3 changes.

The local department held a family involvement meeting for the placement changes for 1 of the 15 cases.

The following levels of care were found for the 15 most recent placement changes:

- 7 case(s) were less restrictive placements
- 3 case(s) were more restrictive placements
- 4 case(s) had the same level of care
- 1 case(s) was a runaway

The primary positive reason for the most recent placement changes:

- 9 case(s) were transitioning towards permanency goal

Provider specific issues for the most recent placement changes included:

- 3 case(s) provider home closed

Child/youth specific issues for the most recent placement changes included:

- 5 case(s) behavioral issues

Were adequate services provided to support the provider in the previous placements?

- Yes, for 14 of the 15 cases

Current placement match between child's needs and the provider's ability to meet those needs:

- Yes, for all 15 cases

### Health/Mental Health

- Developmental/Special Needs: The local department reported that 3 of the 24 children/youths reviewed had developmental or special needs.
- Current Physical: 22 children/youths had a current physical exam.
- Current Vision: 17 children/youths had a current vision exam.
- Current Dental: 19 children/youths had a current dental exam.
- Follow-up Health Concerns: The local department ensured that appropriate follow-ups occurred on all health concerns noted by a physician for all 7 children/youths requiring follow-ups.
- Completed Medical Records: The local departments reported that 14 of the 24 children/youths had completed medical records in their case files.
- Prescription Medication: 16 children/youths were taking prescription medication.
- Prescription Medication Monitored: Prescription medication was being monitored regularly for the 16 children/youths.
- Psychotropic Medication: 15 children/youths were taking psychotropic medication.
- Psychotropic Medication Monitored: Psychotropic medication was being monitored at least quarterly for the 15 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues: 21 children/youths had mental health issues.
- Mental Health Diagnosis: 21 children/youths had a mental health diagnosis.
- Mental Health Issues Addressed: Yes, for 20 of the 21 children/youths.

- Mental Health Issues/Transitioning/Services: 2 youths with mental health issues who were transitioning out of care, had an identified plan to receive services in the adult mental health system and 1 youth did not have an identified plan.
- Substance Abuse: None of the 24 children/youths had a substance abuse problem.
- Substance Abuse Addressed: Not applicable.
- Behavioral Issues: 21 children/youths had behavioral issues.
- Behavioral Issues Addressed: Yes, for 20 of the 21 children/youths.

The local board found that the health needs of 15 of the 24 children/youths had been met and 1 child/youth refused to comply with standard health exams.

### Education

21 of the 24 children/youths reviewed were enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program. 20 were in Pre-K through 12 grade and 1 was in college. The 3 youths not enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had already graduated high school.

9 of the 21 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had a 504 or IEP plan and 8 had a copy of the 504/IEP plan in the child/youth's record.

A current progress report/report card was available for review for 20 of the 21 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program.

The local board agreed that all 21 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were being appropriately prepared to meet educational goals.

### Ready By 21

#### ➤ Employment (age 14 and older – 17 cases)

8 of the 17 youths were employed or participating in paid or unpaid work experience.

The local board agreed that 13 youths were being appropriately prepared to meet employment goals.

#### ➤ Independent Living Services (age 14 and older – 17 cases)

The local board agreed that 13 youths were receiving appropriate services to prepare for independent living.

#### ➤ Housing (Transitioning Youth – 4 cases)

(Age 20 and/or planning to discharge within a year from the review)

Housing had been specified for the 4 youths transitioning out of care.

The local board agreed that the youths were being appropriately prepared to transition out of care.

### Child's Consent to Adoption

The age of consent for adoption in the State of Maryland is 10. Children 10 and older must consent to be adopted. All 4 children/youths with a plan of adoption consented to adoption.

### Adoptive Placement Services and Resources (4 cases)

#### Pre-Adoptive Placement (4 cases)

All 4 children/youths with an adoption plan were placed in pre-adoptive homes. The pre-adoptive family structure was comprised of a married couple for all 4 cases. The relationships to the pre-adoptive children/youths were non relative foster parents for all 4 cases.

Lengths of time in the pre-adoptive placements were as follows:

- 3 case(s) from 10 to 12 months
- 1 case(s) from 21 months or more

A home study was completed and approved for all 4 cases.

The local board agreed that appropriate services and supports were in place for the pre-adoptive families to meet the identified needs of the children/youths in the 4 cases.

The local board agreed that the pre-adoptive placements were appropriate for all 4 cases.

### Adoptive Recruitment (None)

Not applicable. All 4 children/youths were already placed in pre-adoptive homes.

### Post-Adoptive Services and Resources (4 cases)

Post adoptive services were needed for the 4 cases. The services that were needed were medical for all 4 cases, mental health services for 1 case and educational services for 1 case.

The local board found that the post adoptive services were appropriate for the 4 cases.

### Miscellaneous Findings

#### Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

13 of the 24 cases had a CASA.

## Risk and Safety

The local board agreed that safety and risk protocols were followed for all 24 cases.

### Child Visits with Parents, Relatives and Siblings

Child Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	13	7
No	11	17

Frequency of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Daily		1
Once a week	5	2
More than once a week	1	1
Once a month	3	
More than once a month	3	
Quarterly	1	3
Yes, but undocumented		

Supervision of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Supervised	4	
Unsupervised	9	7

Who Supervises Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
LDSS Agency Representative	3	
Other Agency Representative	1	
Biological Family Member		
Foster Parent		
Other		

Where do Visits Occur ?	With Parents	With Relatives
Parent/Relative Home	7	6
LDSS Visitation Center	2	
Public Area	1	1
Child's/Youth's Placement	3	
Other		

Overnight Stays	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	4	4
No	9	3

The local board found that 16 of the 24 children/youths had siblings in care. 7 had 1 sibling in care and 9 had 2.

### Barriers/Issues

The local board identified the following barriers to permanency or issues:

- Notification not published.
- No service agreement with youth.
- Missing or lack of documentation.
- No concurrent plan by court
- Dentals not current.
- Vision not current.
- Other independence barrier.
- Non-compliant with service agreement.
- Youth placed outside of home jurisdiction.

### Summary

Based on the findings of the review the local board determined that the local Department of Social Services made adequate progress towards a permanent placement (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (F)) for 23 of the 24 children/youths reviewed.

## Montgomery County



Montgomery County had a total of 30 cases that were reviewed with the following permanency plans:

- Reunification: 9 cases
- Relative Placement for Adoption: 2 cases
- Relative Placement for Custody/Guardianship: 1 case
- Non Relative Adoption: 9 cases
- Non Relative Custody/Guardianship: 2 cases
- APPLA: 7 cases

### Permanency

The local board agreed with the department's permanency plan for 28 of the 30 cases reviewed.

The local juvenile court identified a concurrent permanency plan for 2 cases.

The local department was implementing the concurrent permanency plans set by the court for the 2 cases.

### Category of APPLA plan (7 cases)

- Emancipation/Independence (3)
- Transition to an adult supportive living arrangement (4)

### Permanent Connections (APPLA – 7 cases)

All 7 APPLA cases had a permanent connection identified and the local board agreed that the connections were appropriate for the 7 cases.

### Length of time Child/Youth had a Permanency Plan

LENGTH	Reunif	Relative for Adoption	Relative for C & G	Non-Rel Adoption	Non-Rel Cust/Guad	APPLA
0 to 6 months	2		1			1
7 to 11 months	2	1		5	2	1
1 to 2 years	2			1		
2 to 3 years	2	1		1		1

3 years or more	1			2		4
<b>Totals →</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>

### Case Planning

Family Involvement Meetings (prior to entry): The local department held family involvement meetings prior to entry for 10 of the 30 cases reviewed.

Service Agreements: The local department had a signed service agreement for 5 of the 30 cases. 8 cases were Post-TPR children under the age of 14. Efforts to involve the family in the service agreement process were made for 18 of the 22 eligible cases.

The local board agreed that the service agreements were appropriate for 4 of the 5 signed cases.

### Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)

Number of Cases	Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)
4	Formal Kinship Care
10	Pre-Finalized Adoption
1	Regular Foster Care
1	Restricted Relative Foster Care
4	Treatment Foster Care (Private)
6	Therapeutic Group Home
1	Independent Residential Living Program
2	Residential Treatment Center
1	Inpatient Psychiatric Care (LA)

In 16 of the 30 cases reviewed the children/youths were placed in their home jurisdiction in settings that were in close proximity to their communities which allowed for the continuity of services.

The local board agreed with the department's placement plan for 29 of the 30 cases reviewed.

### Placement Stability

In 7 of the 30 cases reviewed there was a placement change within the 12 months prior to the review. 6 cases had 2 placement changes and 1 had 4 or more changes.

The local department held a family involvement meeting for the placement changes for 1 of the 7 cases.

The following levels of care were found for the 7 most recent placement changes:

- 1 case(s) was a less restrictive placement
- 3 case(s) were more restrictive placements
- 3 case(s) had the same level of care

The primary positive reason for the most recent placement changes:

- 1 case(s) was transitioning towards permanency goal
- 1 case(s) was placement with relatives

Provider specific issues for the most recent placement changes included:

- 1 case(s) incompatible match

Child/youth specific issues for the most recent placement changes included:

- 2 case(s) behavioral issues
- 1 case(s) delinquent behavior
- 1 case(s) hospitalization

Were adequate services provided to support the provider in the previous placements?

- Yes, for 6 cases

Current placement match between child's needs and the provider's ability to meet those needs:

- Yes, for all 7 cases

#### Health/Mental Health

- Developmental/Special Needs: The local department reported that 7 of the 30 children/youths reviewed had developmental or special needs.
- Current Physical: 21 children/youths had a current physical exam.
- Current Vision: 16 children/youths had a current vision exam.
- Current Dental: 19 children/youths had a current dental exam.
- Follow-up Health Concerns: The local department ensured that appropriate follow-ups occurred on all health concerns noted by a physician for all 3 children/youths requiring follow-ups.
- Completed Medical Records: The local departments reported that 11 of the 30 children/youths had completed medical records in their case files.
- Prescription Medication: 15 children/youths were taking prescription medication.
- Prescription Medication Monitored: Prescription medication was being monitored regularly for the 15 children/youths.
- Psychotropic Medication: 13 children/youths were taking psychotropic medication.

- Psychotropic Medication Monitored: Psychotropic medication was being monitored at least quarterly for the 13 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues: 21 children/youths had mental health issues.
- Mental Health Diagnosis: 18 children/youths had a mental health diagnosis.
- Mental Health Issues Addressed: Yes, for the 21 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues/Transitioning/Services: 2 youths with mental health issues who were transitioning out of care had an identified plan to receive services in the adult mental health system.
- Substance Abuse: 2 children/youths had a substance abuse problem.
- Substance Abuse Addressed: Yes, for both children/youths.
- Behavioral Issues: 9 children/youths had behavioral issues.
- Behavioral Issues Addressed: Yes, for the 9 children/youths.

The local board found that the health needs of 12 of the 30 children/youths had been met and 1 child/youth refused to comply with standard health exams.

### Education

23 of the 30 children/youths reviewed were enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program. 20 of the 23 were in Pre-K through 12th grade, 1 was enrolled in a GED program and 2 youths were in college. 1 of the 7 youths not enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had already graduated high school and 6 children were under the age of 5.

13 of the 23 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had a 504 or IEP plan and 9 had a copy of the 504/IEP plan in the child/youth's record.

A current progress report/report card was available for review for 14 of the 23 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program.

The local board agreed that 21 of the 23 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were being appropriately prepared to meet educational goals.

### Ready By 21

- Employment (age 14 and older – 13 cases)

6 of the 13 youths were employed or participating in paid or unpaid work experience. 4

youths were unable to participate due to mental health issues.

The local board agreed that 7 youths were being appropriately prepared to meet employment goals.

➤ Independent Living Services (age 14 and older – 13 cases)

The local board agreed that 6 youths were receiving appropriate services to prepare for independent living and 4 youths were not receiving appropriate services due to mental health reasons.

➤ Housing (Transitioning Youth – 3 cases)

(Age 20 and/or planning to discharge within a year from the review)

Housing had not been specified for the 3 youths transitioning out of care; however information on alternative housing options were provided to all 3 youths.

The local board agreed that the 3 youths were being appropriately prepared to transition out of care.

### Child's Consent to Adoption

The age of consent for adoption in the State of Maryland is 10. Children 10 and older must consent to be adopted. Of the 11 cases with a plan of adoption 1 youth consented and 10 children were under the age of consent.

### Adoptive Placement Services and Resources (11 cases)

#### Pre-Adoptive Placement (11 cases)

10 of the 11 children/youths with an adoption plan were placed in pre-adoptive homes. The pre-adoptive family structure was comprised of a married couple for 9 cases and a single female for 1 case. The relationships to the pre-adoptive children/youths were relative foster parents in 7 cases, non relative foster parents in 2 cases and a fictive kin in 1 case.

Lengths of time in the pre-adoptive placements were as follows:

- 1 case(s) from 12 to 15 months
- 1 case(s) from 16 to 20 months
- 8 case(s) from 21 months or more

A home study was completed and approved for 5 of the 10 cases.

The local board agreed that appropriate services and supports were in place for the pre-adoptive families to meet the identified needs of the children/youths in all 10 cases.

The local board agreed that the pre-adoptive placements were appropriate for all 10 cases.

### Adoptive Recruitment (1 case)

The local board found that the local department had documented efforts to find an adoptive resource for the 1 child/youth not placed in a pre-adoptive home. The adoptive resource was former foster parents.

### Post-Adoptive Services and Resources (11 cases)

Post adoptive services were needed for the 11 children/youths. The services that were needed were medical for 10 cases, educational, respite and DDA services for 1 case.

The local board found that the post adoptive services were appropriate for the 11 cases.

### Miscellaneous Findings

#### Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

16 of the 30 cases had a CASA.

#### Risk and Safety

The local board agreed that safety and risk protocols were followed for 28 of the 30 cases.

#### Child Visits with Parents, Relatives and Siblings

Child Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	17	12
No	13	18

Frequency of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Daily		
Once a week	1	
More than once a week	1	1
Once a month	6	1
More than once a month	3	3
Quarterly	2	1
Yes, but undocumented	4	6

Supervision of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Supervised	8	3
Unsupervised	9	9

Who Supervises Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
LDSS Agency Representative	7	3
Other Agency Representative		
Biological Family Member	1	
Foster Parent		
Other		

Where do Visits Occur ?	With Parents	With Relatives
Parent/Relative Home		5
LDSS Visitation Center	6	1
Public Area	5	4
Child's/Youth's Placement	5	2
Other	1	

Overnight Stays	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	4	2
No	13	10

The local board found that 12 of the 30 children/youths had siblings in care. 6 had 1 sibling in care and 6 had 2.

### Barriers/Issues

The local board identified the following barriers to permanency or issues:

- No service agreement with parents.
- No service agreement with youth.
- Other educational barrier.
- Annual physicals not current.
- Dentals not current.
- Vision not current.
- Youth placed outside of home jurisdiction.

### Summary

Based on the findings of the review the local board determined that the local Department of Social Services made adequate progress towards a permanent placement (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (F)) for 29 of the 30 children/youths reviewed.

## Prince George's County



Prince George's County had a total of 26 cases that were reviewed with the following permanency plans:

- Reunification: 11 cases
- Non Relative Adoption: 5 cases
- Non Relative Custody/Guardianship: 1 case
- APPLA: 9 cases

### Permanency

The local board agreed with the department's permanency plan for 25 of the 26 cases reviewed.

The local juvenile court identified a concurrent permanency plan for 2 cases.

The local department was implementing the concurrent permanency plans set by the court for the 2 cases.

### Category of APPLA plan (9 cases)

- Emancipation/Independence (9)

### Permanent Connections (APPLA – 9 cases)

7 of the 9 APPLA cases had a permanent connection identified and the local board agreed that the connections were appropriate for the 7 cases.

### Length of time Child/Youth had a Permanency Plan

LENGTH	Reunif	Relative for Adoption	Relative for C & G	Non-Rel Adoption	Non-Rel Cust/Guad	APPLA
0 to 6 months				1		4
7 to 11 months	1			1	1	1
1 to 2 years	5			2		2
2 to 3 years	2					1
3 years or more	3			1		1
<b>Totals →</b>	<b>11</b>			<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>

## Case Planning

Family Involvement Meetings (prior to entry): The local department held family involvement meetings prior to entry for 24 of the 26 cases reviewed.

Service Agreements: The local department had a signed service agreement for 8 of the 26 cases. 3 cases were Post-TPR children under the age of 14. Efforts to involve the family in the service agreement process were made for 8 of the 23 eligible cases.

The local board agreed that the service agreements were appropriate for 6 of the 8 signed cases.

## Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)

Number of Cases	Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)
3	Formal Kinship Care
2	Pre-Finalized Adoption
1	Regular Foster Care
4	Treatment Foster Care
3	Treatment Foster Care (Private)
2	Residential Group Home
4	Therapeutic Group Home
2	Independent Residential Living Program
1	Residential Treatment Center
1	Non Relative
1	Inpatient Medical Care (LA)
1	Trial Home Visit (LA)
1	Secure Detention Facility (LA)

In 11 of the 26 cases reviewed the children/youths were placed in their home jurisdiction in settings that were in close proximity to their communities which allowed for the continuity of services.

The local board agreed with the department's placement plan for 24 of the 26 cases reviewed.

## Placement Stability

In 12 of the 26 cases reviewed there was a placement change within the 12 months prior to the review. 5 cases had 1 placement change, 4 had 2 changes, 1 had 3 changes and 2 had 4 or more changes.

The local department held a family involvement meeting for the placement changes for 7 of the 12 cases.

The following levels of care were found for the 12 most recent placement changes:

- 2 case(s) were less restrictive placements
- 5 case(s) were more restrictive placements

- 5 case(s) had the same level of care

The primary positive reason for the most recent placement changes:

- 1 case(s) was transitioning towards permanency goal
- 1 case(s) was placement with relatives

Provider specific issues for the most recent placement changes included:

- 2 case(s) provider home closed

Child/youth specific issues for the most recent placement changes included:

- 7 case(s) behavioral issues

Were adequate services provided to support the provider in the previous placements?

- Yes, for all 12 cases

Current placement match between child's needs and the provider's ability to meet those needs:

- Yes, for all 125 cases

### Health/Mental Health

- Developmental/Special Needs: The local department reported that 13 of the 26 children/youths reviewed had developmental or special needs.
- Current Physical: 16 children/youths had a current physical exam.
- Current Vision: 11 children/youths had a current vision exam.
- Current Dental: 13 children/youths had a current dental exam.
- Follow-up Health Concerns: The local department ensured that appropriate follow-ups occurred on all health concerns noted by a physician for all 4 children/youths requiring follow-ups.
- Completed Medical Records: The local departments reported that 10 of the 26 children/youths had completed medical records in their case files.
- Prescription Medication: 16 children/youths were taking prescription medication.
- Prescription Medication Monitored: Prescription medication was being monitored regularly for 15 of the 16 children/youths.
- Psychotropic Medication: 14 children/youths were taking psychotropic medication.

- Psychotropic Medication Monitored: Psychotropic medication was being monitored at least quarterly for the 14 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues: 23 children/youths had mental health issues.
- Mental Health Diagnosis: 23 children/youths had a mental health diagnosis.
- Mental Health Issues Addressed: Yes, for 21 of the 23 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues/Transitioning/Services: 2 youths with mental health issues who were transitioning out of care had an identified plan to receive services in the adult mental health system and 1 youth did not have a plan.
- Substance Abuse: 7 children/youths had a substance abuse problem.
- Substance Abuse Addressed: Yes, for 5 of the 7 children/youths.
- Behavioral Issues: 15 children/youths had behavioral issues.
- Behavioral Issues Addressed: Yes, for 14 of the 15 children/youths.

The local board found that the health needs of 9 of the 26 children/youths had been met.

### Education

21 of the 26 children/youths reviewed were enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program. All 21 were in Pre-K through 12th grade. 2 of the 5 youths not enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had already graduated high school, 2 refused to attend school and 1 was under the age of 5.

12 of the 21 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had a 504 or IEP plan and 9 had a copy of the 504/IEP plan in the child/youth's record.

A current progress report/report card was available for review for 8 of the 21 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program.

The local board agreed that 19 of the 21 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were being appropriately prepared to meet educational goals.

### Ready By 21

- Employment (age 14 and older – 16 cases)

5 of the 16 youths were employed or participating in paid or unpaid work experience. 3 youths were unable to participate due to mental health issues.

The local board agreed that 6 youths were being appropriately prepared to meet employment goals.

➤ Independent Living Services (age 14 and older – 16 cases)

The local board agreed that 7 youths were receiving appropriate services to prepare for independent living and 3 youths were not receiving appropriate services due to mental health reasons.

➤ Housing (Transitioning Youth – 3 cases)  
(Age 20 and/or planning to discharge within a year from the review)

Housing had been specified for the 3 youths transitioning out of care.

The local board agreed that the 3 youths were being appropriately prepared to transition out of care.

Child's Consent to Adoption

The age of consent for adoption in the State of Maryland is 10. Children 10 and older must consent to be adopted. Of the 5 cases with a plan of adoption, 1 youth consented, 3 children were under the age of consent and consent was unknown for 1 child/youth.

Adoptive Placement Services and Resources (5 cases)

Pre-Adoptive Placement (5 cases)

3 of the 5 children/youths with an adoption plan were placed in pre-adoptive homes. The pre-adoptive family structure was comprised of a married couple for all 3 cases. The relationships to the pre-adoptive children/youths were non relative foster parents in all 3 cases.

Lengths of time in the pre-adoptive placements were as follows:

- 3 case(s) from 12 to 15 months

A home study was completed and approved for 2 of the 3 cases.

The local board agreed that appropriate services and supports were in place for the pre-adoptive families to meet the identified needs of the children/youths in all 3 cases.

The local board agreed that the pre-adoptive placements were appropriate for all 3 cases.

Adoptive Recruitment (2 cases)

The local board found that the local department had documented efforts to find an adoptive resource for 1 of the 2 children/youths not placed in a pre-adoptive home. The adoptive resources were Wendy's Wonderful Kids, The Barker Foundation and Adoptions Together. The local board agreed that the adoptive recruitment efforts were appropriate for the 1 case.

### Post-Adoptive Services and Resources (5 cases)

Post adoptive services were needed for 3 of the 5 children/youths. The services that were needed were medical, mental health and educational services for all 3 cases.

The local board found that the post adoptive service was appropriate for the 3 cases.

### Miscellaneous Findings

#### Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

4 of the 26 cases had a CASA.

#### Risk and Safety

The local board agreed that safety and risk protocols were followed for 25 of the 26 cases.

#### Child Visits with Parents, Relatives and Siblings

Child Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	15	13
No	11	13

Frequency of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Daily		1
Once a week	4	3
More than once a week		
Once a month	3	
More than once a month	1	2
Quarterly		1
Yes, but undocumented	7	6

Supervision of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Supervised	6	2
Unsupervised	9	11

Who Supervises Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
LDSS Agency Representative		
Other Agency Representative		
Biological Family Member		

Foster Parent	2	2
Other	4	

Where do Visits Occur ?	With Parents	With Relatives
Parent/Relative Home	9	13
LDSS Visitation Center		
Public Area	1	
Child's/Youth's Placement	3	
Other	2	

Overnight Stays	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	7	8
No	8	5

The local board found that 9 of the 26 children/youths had siblings in care. All 9 had 1 sibling in care.

### Barriers/Issues

The local board identified the following barriers to permanency or issues:

- No service agreement with parents.
- No service agreement with youth.
- Missing or lack of documentation.
- Agency related barriers.
- Annual physicals not current.
- Dentals not current.
- Vision not current.
- Other education barrier.
- Other independence barrier.
- Youth placed outside of home jurisdiction.
- Youth engages in risky behavior.
- Lack of concurrent planning.
- Inadequate preparation for independence (general).
- Lack of employment.

### Summary

Based on the findings of the review the local board determined that the local Department of Social Services made adequate progress towards a permanent placement (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (F)) for 23 of the 26 children/youths reviewed.

## St. Mary's County



St. Mary's County had a total of 8 cases that were reviewed with the following permanency plans:

- Reunification: 3 cases
- Relative Placement for Adoption: 1 case
- Relative Placement for Custody/Guardianship: 1 case
- Non Relative Adoption: 1 case
- Non Relative Custody/Guardianship: 2 cases

### Permanency

The local board agreed with the department's permanency plan for all 8 cases reviewed.

The local juvenile court identified a concurrent permanency plan for 4 cases.

The local department was implementing the concurrent permanency plans set by the court for the 4 cases.

### Category of APPLA plan (None)

### Permanent Connections APPLA (None)

### Length of time Child/Youth had a Permanency Plan

LENGTH	Reunif	Relative for Adoption	Relative for C & G	Non-Rel Adoption	Non-Rel Cust/Guad	APPLA
0 to 6 months						
7 to 11 months		1		1		
1 to 2 years	2					
2 to 3 years			1			
3 years or more	1				2	
<b>Totals →</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	

## Case Planning

Family Involvement Meetings (prior to entry): The local department held family involvement meetings prior to entry for all 8 cases reviewed.

Service Agreements: The local department had a signed service agreement for 5 of the 8 cases. 1 case was a Post-TPR child under the age of 14. Efforts to involve the family in the service agreement process were made for 5 of the 7 eligible cases.

The local board agreed that the service agreements were appropriate for the 5 signed cases.

## Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)

Number of Cases	Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)
2	Pre-Finalized Adoption
3	Treatment Foster Care
1	Residential Group Home
2	Trial Home Visit (LA)

In 2 of the 8 cases reviewed the children/youths were placed in their home jurisdiction in settings that were in close proximity to their communities which allowed for the continuity of services.

The local board agreed with the department's placement plan for all 8 cases reviewed.

## Placement Stability

In 4 of the 8 cases reviewed there was a placement change within the 12 months prior to the review. All 4 cases had 2 placement changes.

The local department held a family involvement meeting for the placement changes for 3 of the 4 cases.

The following levels of care were found for the 4 most recent placement changes:

- 3 case(s) were less restrictive placements
- 1 case(s) had the same level of care

The primary positive reason for the most recent placement changes:

- 3 case(s) were transitioning towards permanency goal
- 1 case(s) was placement with siblings

Were adequate services provided to support the provider in the previous placements?

- Yes, for 3 of the 4 cases

Current placement match between child's needs and the provider's ability to meet those needs:

- Yes, for all 4 cases

### Health/Mental Health

- Developmental/Special Needs: The local department reported that 3 of the 8 children/youths reviewed had developmental or special needs.
- Current Physical: 8 children/youths had a current physical exam.
- Current Vision: 7 children/youths had a current vision exam.
- Current Dental: 8 children/youths had a current dental exam.
- Follow-up Health Concerns: The local department ensured that appropriate follow-ups occurred on all health concerns noted by a physician for 1 of the 2 children/youths requiring follow-ups.
- Completed Medical Records: The local departments reported that 7 of the 8 children/youths had completed medical records in their case files.
- Prescription Medication: 2 children/youths were taking prescription medication.
- Prescription Medication Monitored: Prescription medication was being monitored regularly for the 2 children/youths.
- Psychotropic Medication: 1 child/youth was taking psychotropic medication.
- Psychotropic Medication Monitored: Psychotropic medication was being monitored at least quarterly for the 1 child/youth.
- Mental Health Issues: 3 children/youths had mental health issues.
- Mental Health Diagnosis: 2 children/youths had a mental health diagnosis.
- Mental Health Issues Addressed: Yes, for 2 of the 3 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues/Transitioning/Services: Not applicable. None of the 3 youths with mental health issues were transitioning out of care.
- Substance Abuse: None of the 8 children/youths had a substance abuse problem.
- Substance Abuse Addressed: Not applicable.
- Behavioral Issues: 2 children/youths had behavioral issues.
- Behavioral Issues Addressed: Yes, for both children/youths.

The local board found that the health needs of 7 of the 8 children/youths had been met.

### Education

6 of the 8 children/youths reviewed were enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program. All 6 were in Pre-K through 12th grade. The 2 children not enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were under the age of 5.

3 of the 6 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had a 504 or IEP plan and 1 had a copy of the 504/IEP plan in the child/youth's record.

A current progress report/report card was not available for review for the 6 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program.

The local board agreed that the 6 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were being appropriately prepared to meet educational goals.

### Ready By 21

#### ➤ Employment (age 14 and older – 2 cases)

1 of the 2 youths was employed or participating in paid or unpaid work experience.

The local board agreed that 1 youth was being appropriately prepared to meet employment goals.

#### ➤ Independent Living Services (age 14 and older – 2 cases)

The local board agreed that both youths were receiving appropriate services to prepare for independent living.

#### ➤ Housing (Transitioning Youth – None)

(Age 20 and/or planning to discharge within a year from the review)

Not applicable.

### Child's Consent to Adoption

The age of consent for adoption in the State of Maryland is 10. Children 10 and older must consent to be adopted. Both children with plans of adoption were under the age of consent.

### Adoptive Placement Services and Resources (2 cases)

#### Pre-Adoptive Placement (2 cases)

Both children/youths with an adoption plan were placed in pre-adoptive homes. The

pre-adoptive family structure was comprised of a married couple for both cases. The relationships to the pre-adoptive children/youths were a relative foster parent for 1 child and non relative foster parent for the other.

Lengths of time in the pre-adoptive placements were as follows:

- 2 case(s) from 21 months or more

A home study was completed and approved for both cases.

The local board agreed that appropriate services and supports were in place for the pre-adoptive families to meet the identified needs of the children/youths in both cases.

The local board agreed that the pre-adoptive placements were appropriate for both cases.

Adoptive Recruitment (None)

Not applicable. Both children were already placed in pre-adoptive homes.

Post-Adoptive Services and Resources (2 cases)

Post adoptive services were not needed for the 2 children/youths.

Miscellaneous Findings

Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

1 of the 8 cases had a CASA.

Risk and Safety

The local board agreed that safety and risk protocols were followed for all 8 cases.

Child Visits with Parents, Relatives and Siblings

Child Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	5	5
No	3	3

Frequency of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Daily		1
Once a week	1	
More than once a week	1	
Once a month		1

More than once a month	2	2
Quarterly		
Yes, but undocumented	1	1

Supervision of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Supervised	2	1
Unsupervised	3	4

Who Supervises Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
LDSS Agency Representative	1	1
Other Agency Representative		
Biological Family Member		
Foster Parent	1	
Other		

Where do Visits Occur ?	With Parents	With Relatives
Parent/Relative Home	3	4
LDSS Visitation Center		
Public Area		
Child's/Youth's Placement	1	
Other	1	1

Overnight Stays	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	4	4
No	1	1

The local board found that 4 of the 8 children/youths had siblings in care. All 4 had 1 sibling in care.

### Barriers/Issues

The local board identified the following barriers to permanency or issues:

- Vision not current.
- Other physical health barrier.
- Financial disincentives to permanence.

### Summary

Based on the findings of the review the local board determined that the local Department of Social Services made adequate progress towards a permanent placement (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (F)) for all 8 children/youths reviewed.

### **Somerset County**



Somerset County had a total of 3 cases that were reviewed with the following permanency plans:

- Reunification: 1 case
- Non Relative Adoption: 1 case
- APPLA: 1 case

Permanency

The local board agreed with the department’s permanency plan for all 3 cases reviewed.

The local juvenile court identified a concurrent permanency plan for 1 case.

The local department was implementing the concurrent permanency plan set by the court for the 1 case.

Category of APPLA plan (1 case)

- Emancipation/Independence (1)

Permanent Connections (APPLA – 1 case)

The 1 APPLA cases had a permanent connection identified and the local board agreed that the connection was appropriate for the 1 case.

Length of time Child/Youth had a Permanency Plan

LENGTH	Reunif	Relative for Adoption	Relative for C & G	Non-Rel Adoption	Non-Rel Cust/Guad	APPLA
0 to 6 months						
7 to 11 months						1
1 to 2 years	1			1		
2 to 3 years						
3 years or more						
<b>Totals →</b>	<b>1</b>			<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>

Case Planning

Family Involvement Meetings (prior to entry): The local department held family involvement meetings prior to entry for all 3 cases reviewed.

Service Agreements: The local department had signed service agreements for 1 of the 3 cases. 1 child/youth was a Post-TPR child under the age of 14. Efforts to involve the family in the service agreement process were made for 1 of the 2 eligible cases.

The local board agreed that the service agreement was appropriate for the 1 signed case.

#### Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)

Number of Cases	Placement/Living Arrangement
1	Pre Finalized Adoptive Home
1	Secure Detention Facility (LA)
1	Trial Home Visit (LA)

In 1 of the 3 cases reviewed the children/youths were placed in their home jurisdiction in settings that were in close proximity to their communities which allowed for the continuity of services.

The local board agreed with the department's placement plan for all 3 cases reviewed.

#### Placement Stability

In 2 of the 3 cases reviewed there was a placement change within the 12 months prior to the review. 1 case had 1 placement change and 1 case had 2 changes.

The local department did not hold a family involvement meeting for the placement changes for any of the 2 cases.

The following levels of care were found for the 2 most recent placement changes:

- 1 case(s) was a less restrictive placement
- 1 case(s) was a more restrictive placement

The primary positive reason for the most recent placement changes:

- 1 case(s) was transitioning towards permanency goal

Child/youth specific issues for the most recent placement changes:

- 1 case(s) delinquent behavioral

Were adequate services provided to support the provider in the previous placements?

- Yes, for 1 of the 2 cases

Current placement match between child's needs and the provider's ability to meet those needs:

- Yes, for both cases

### Health/Mental Health

- Developmental/Special Needs: The local department reported that none of the 3 children/youths reviewed had developmental or special needs.
- Current Physical: 3 children/youths had a current physical exam.
- Current Vision: 2 children/youths had a current vision exam.
- Current Dental: 2 children/youths had a current dental exam.
- Follow-up Health Concerns: The local department ensured that appropriate follow-ups occurred on all health concerns noted by a physician for all 2 children/youths requiring follow-ups.
- Completed Medical Records: The local departments reported that 2 of the 3 children/youths had completed medical records in their case files.
- Prescription Medication: 3 children/youths were taking prescription medication.
- Prescription Medication Monitored: Prescription medication was being monitored regularly for the 3 children/youths.
- Psychotropic Medication: 3 children/youths were taking psychotropic medication.
- Psychotropic Medication Monitored: Psychotropic medication was being monitored at least quarterly for the 3 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues: 3 children/youths had mental health issues.
- Mental Health Diagnosis: 3 children/youths had a mental health diagnosis.
- Mental Health Issues Addressed: Yes, for all 3 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues/Transitioning/Services: 1 youth with mental health issues who was transitioning out of care, had an identified plan to receive services in the adult mental health system.
- Substance Abuse: None of the 3 children/youths had a substance abuse problem.
- Substance Abuse Addressed: Not applicable.
- Behavioral Issues: 3 children/youths had behavioral issues.
- Behavioral Issues Addressed: Yes, for all 3 children/youths.

The local board found that the health needs of 2 of the 3 children/youths had been met.

### Education

All 3 children/youths reviewed were enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program. All 3 were in Pre-K through 12th grade.

1 of the 3 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had a 504 or IEP plan and 1 had a copy of the 504/IEP plan in the child/youth's record.

A current progress report/report card was not available for review for the 3 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program.

The local board agreed that the 3 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were being appropriately prepared to meet educational goals.

### Ready By 21

➤ Employment (age 14 and older – 1 case)

The youth was in a Juvenile Justice Facility.

➤ Independent Living Services (age 14 and older – 1 case)

The youth was in a Juvenile Justice Facility.

➤ Housing (Transitioning Youth – None)

(Age 20 and/or planning to discharge within a year from the review)

Not applicable.

### Child's Consent to Adoption

The age of consent for adoption in the State of Maryland is 10. Children 10 and older must consent to be adopted. The 1 child with a plan of adoption was under the age of consent.

### Adoptive Placement Services and Resources (1 case)

#### Pre-Adoptive Placement (1 case)

The child with an adoption plan was placed in a pre-adoptive home. The pre-adoptive family structure was comprised of a single female. The relationship to the pre-adoptive child was a non relative foster parent.

Lengths of time in the pre-adoptive placements were as follows:

- 1 case(s) from 21 months or more

A home study was completed and approved for the 1 case.

The local board agreed that appropriate services and supports were in place for the pre-adoptive family to meet the identified needs of the child in the 1 case.

The local board agreed that the pre-adoptive placement was appropriate for the child.

Adoptive Recruitment (None)

Not applicable. Child already placed in pre-adoptive home.

Post-Adoptive Services and Resources (1 case)

Post adoptive services were needed for the 1 adoption case. The services that were needed were medical, mental health and educational services for the case.

The local board found that the post adoptive services were appropriate for the case.

Miscellaneous Findings

Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

None of the 3 cases had a CASA.

Risk and Safety

The local board agreed that safety and risk protocols were followed for all 3 cases.

Child Visits with Parents, Relatives and Siblings

Child Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes		
No	3	3

Frequency of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Daily		
Once a week		
More than once a week		
Once a month		
More than once a month		

Quarterly		
Yes, but undocumented		

Supervision of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Supervised		
Unsupervised		

Who Supervises Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
LDSS Agency Representative		
Other Agency Representative		
Biological Family Member		
Foster Parent		
Other		

Where do Visits Occur ?	With Parents	With Relatives
Parent/Relative Home		
LDSS Visitation Center		
Public Area		
Child's/Youth's Placement		
Other		

Overnight Stays	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes		
No		

The local board found that none of the 3 children/youths had siblings in care.

### Barriers/Issues

The local board identified the following barriers to permanency or issues:

- Youth placed outside of home jurisdiction.
- Missing or lack of documentation.
- Dentals not current.
- Vision not current.

### Summary

Based on the findings of the review the local board determined that the local Department of Social Services made adequate progress towards a permanent placement (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (F)) for all 3 children/youths reviewed.



Washington County had a total of 16 cases that were reviewed with the following permanency plans:

- Reunification: 10 cases
- Non Relative Adoption: 3 cases
- APPLA: 3 cases

### Permanency

The local board agreed with the department’s permanency plan for 14 of the 16 cases reviewed.

The local juvenile court did not identify a concurrent permanency plan for any of the 16 cases.

### Category of APPLA plan (3 cases)

- Emancipation/Independence (2)
- Transition to an adult supportive living arrangement (1)

### Permanent Connections (APPLA – 3 cases)

All 3 APPLA cases had a permanent connection identified and the local board agreed that the connections were appropriate for the 3 cases.

### Length of time Child/Youth had a Permanency Plan

LENGTH	Reunif	Relative for Adoption	Relative for C & G	Non-Rel Adoption	Non-Rel Cust/Guad	APPLA
0 to 6 months				1		2
7 to 11 months	1					1
1 to 2 years	9			2		
2 to 3 years						
3 years or more						
<b>Totals →</b>	<b>10</b>			<b>3</b>		<b>3</b>

### Case Planning

Family Involvement Meetings (prior to entry): The local department held family involvement meetings prior to entry for all 16 cases reviewed.

Service Agreements: The local department had signed service agreements for 8 of the 16 cases. 2 cases were Post-TPR children/youths under the age of 14. Efforts to involve the family in the service agreement process were made for 8 of the eligible 14 cases.

The local board agreed that the service agreements were appropriate for all 8 signed cases.

#### Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)

Number of Cases	Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)
2	Pre-Finalized Adoptive Home
3	Regular Foster Care
5	Treatment Foster Care (Private)
1	Therapeutic Group Home
1	Non relative
4	Trial Home Visit (LA)

In 9 of the 16 cases reviewed the children/youths were placed in their home jurisdiction in settings that were in close proximity to their communities which allowed for the continuity of services.

The local board agreed with the department's placement plan for all 16 cases reviewed.

#### Placement Stability

In 11 of the 16 cases reviewed there was a placement change within the 12 months prior to the review. 7 cases had 1 placement change, 3 had 2 changes and 1 case had 3 changes.

The local department held a family involvement meeting for the placement changes for 4 of the 11 cases.

The following levels of care were found for the 11 most recent placement changes:

- 8 case(s) were less restrictive placements
- 2 case(s) were same level of care
- 1 case(s) was unknown, information not available

The primary positive reason for the most recent placement changes:

- 8 case(s) were transitioning towards permanency goal

Provider specific issues for the most recent placement changes included:

- 2 case(s) founded incident of provider abuse/neglect

Child/youth specific issues for the most recent placement changes:

- 1 case(s) behavioral issues

Were adequate services provided to support the provider in the previous placements?

- Yes, for 8 of the 11 cases

Current placement match between child's needs and the provider's ability to meet those needs:

- Yes, for all 11 cases

### Health/Mental Health

- Developmental/Special Needs: The local department reported that 2 of the 16 children/youths reviewed had developmental or special needs.
- Current Physical: 12 children/youths had a current physical exam.
- Current Vision: 10 children/youths had a current vision exam.
- Current Dental: 13 children/youths had a current dental exam.
- Follow-up Health Concerns: The local department ensured that appropriate follow-ups occurred on all health concerns noted by a physician for 2 of the 3 children/youths requiring follow-ups.
- Completed Medical Records: The local departments reported that 9 of the 16 children/youths had completed medical records in their case files.
- Prescription Medication: 6 children/youths were taking prescription medication.
- Prescription Medication Monitored: Prescription medication was being monitored regularly for the 6 children/youths.
- Psychotropic Medication: 5 children/youths were taking psychotropic medication.
- Psychotropic Medication Monitored: Psychotropic medication was being monitored at least quarterly for the 5 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues: 14 children/youths had mental health issues.
- Mental Health Diagnosis: 14 children/youths had a mental health diagnosis.
- Mental Health Issues Addressed: Yes, for 13 of the 14 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues/Transitioning/Services: 1 youth with mental health issues who was

transitioning out of care did not have an identified plan to receive services in the adult mental health system.

- Substance Abuse: None of the 16 children/youths had a substance abuse problem.
- Substance Abuse Addressed: Not applicable.
- Behavioral Issues: 12 children/youths had behavioral issues.
- Behavioral Issues Addressed: Yes, for all 12 children/youths.

The local board found that the health needs of 7 of the 16 children/youths had been met.

### Education

14 of the 16 children/youths reviewed were enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program. All 14 were in Pre-K through 12th grade. 1 of the 2 children/youths not enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had already graduated high school and 1 was under the age of 5.

5 of the 14 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had a 504 or IEP plan and 4 had a copy of the 504/IEP plan in the child/youth's record.

A current progress report/report card was available for review for 5 of the 14 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program.

The local board agreed that 13 of the 14 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were being appropriately prepared to meet educational goals.

### Ready By 21

- Employment (age 14 and older – 6 cases)

3 of the 6 youths were employed or participating in paid or unpaid work experience. 1 youth was unable to participate due to being medically fragile.

The local board agreed that 5 youths were being appropriately prepared to meet employment goals.

- Independent Living Services (age 14 and older – 6 cases)

The local board agreed that 5 youths were receiving appropriate services to prepare for independent living and 1 youth was not receiving appropriate services due to being medically fragile.

- Housing (Transitioning Youth – 1 case)

(Age 20 and/or planning to discharge within a year from the review)

Housing had been specified for the youth transitioning out of care.

The local board agreed that the youth was being appropriately prepared to transition out of care.

### Child's Consent to Adoption

The age of consent for adoption in the State of Maryland is 10. Children 10 and older must consent to be adopted. Of the 3 cases with a plan of adoption, 2 children/youths did not want to be adopted and 1 was under the age of consent.

### Adoptive Placement Services and Resources (3 cases)

#### Pre-Adoptive Placement (3 cases)

All 3 children/youths with an adoption plan were placed in a pre-adoptive home. The pre-adoptive family structure was comprised of a married couple in 2 cases and a single female in 1 case. The relationships to the pre-adoptive children/youths were non relative foster parents in 1 case and a fictive kin in 2 cases.

Lengths of time in the pre-adoptive placements were as follows:

- 3 case(s) from 21 months or more

A home study was completed and approved for all 3 cases.

The local board agreed that appropriate services and supports were in place for the pre-adoptive families to meet the identified needs of the children/youths in all 3 cases.

The local board agreed that the pre-adoptive placements were appropriate for all 3 cases.

### Adoptive Recruitment (None)

Not applicable. All 3 children/youths were already placed in pre-adoptive homes.

### Post-Adoptive Services and Resources (3 cases)

Post adoptive services were needed for all 3 adoption cases. The service that was needed was medical for all 3 cases.

The local board found that the post adoptive services were appropriate for all 3 cases.

### Miscellaneous Findings

### Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

1 of the 16 cases had a CASA.

### Risk and Safety

The local board agreed that safety and risk protocols were followed for all 16 cases.

### Child Visits with Parents, Relatives and Siblings

Child Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	7	2
No	9	14

Frequency of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Daily		
Once a week		
More than once a week	3	
Once a month	3	
More than once a month		1
Quarterly	1	1
Yes, but undocumented		

Supervision of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Supervised		1
Unsupervised	7	1

Who Supervises Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
LDSS Agency Representative		1
Other Agency Representative		
Biological Family Member		
Foster Parent		
Other		

Where do Visits Occur ?	With Parents	With Relatives
Parent/Relative Home	2	2
LDSS Visitation Center		
Public Area	4	
Child's/Youth's Placement	1	
Other		

Overnight Stays	With Parents	With Relatives

Yes	2	1
No	5	1

The local board found that 11 of the 16 children/youths had siblings in care. 3 had 2 siblings and 8 had 3 siblings in care.

Barriers/Issues


The local board identified the following barriers to permanency or issues:

- No service agreement with parents.
- No concurrent plan by court
- Missing or lack of documentation.
- Annual physicals not current.
- Dentals not current.
- Vision not current.
- Other education barrier.
- Other independence barrier.
- Board does not agree with current permanency plan.

Summary

Based on the findings of the review the local board determined that the local Department of Social Services made adequate progress towards a permanent placement (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (F)) for 15 of the 16 children/youths reviewed.

## **Baltimore City**



Baltimore City had a total of 81 cases that were reviewed with the following permanency plans:

- Reunification: 26 cases
- Relative Placement for Adoption: 2 cases
- Relative Placement for Custody/Guardianship: 4 cases
- Non Relative Adoption: 5 cases
- Non Relative Custody/Guardianship: 10 cases
- APPLA: 34 cases

### Permanency

The local board agreed with the department's permanency plan for 62 of the 81 cases reviewed.

The local juvenile court identified a concurrent permanency plan for 4 cases.

The local department was implementing the concurrent permanency plans set by the court for all 4 cases.

### Category of APPLA plan (34 cases)

- Emancipation/Independence (33)
- Transition to an adult supportive living arrangement (1)

### Permanent Connections (APPLA – 34 cases)

32 of the 34 APPLA cases had a permanent connection identified and the local board agreed that the connections were appropriate for the 32 cases.

Length of time Child/Youth had a Permanency Plan

LENGTH	Reunif	Relative for Adoption	Relative for C & G	Non-Rel Adoption	Non-Rel Cust/Guad	APPLA
0 to 6 months	2		3	3	2	17
7 to 11 months	3				1	3
1 to 2 years	18	1	1		5	5
2 to 3 years	1	1		1		4
3 years or more	2			1	2	5
<b>Totals →</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>34</b>

Case Planning

Family Involvement Meetings (prior to entry): The local department held family involvement meetings prior to entry for 13 of the 81 cases reviewed.

Service Agreements: The local department had a signed service agreement for 32 of the 81 cases. 3 cases were Post-TPR children under the age of 14. Efforts to involve the family in the service agreement process were made for 65 of the 78 eligible cases.

The local board agreed that the service agreements were appropriate for the 32 signed cases.

Placement/Living Arrangement (LA)

Number of Cases	Placement/Living Arrangement
4	Formal Kinship Care
1	Intermediate Foster Care
4	Pre Finalized Adoptive Home
1	Regular Foster Care
2	Restricted (Relative) Foster Care
33	Treatment Foster Care (Private)
2	Residential Group Home
6	Teen Mother Program
8	Therapeutic Group Home
7	Independent Living Residential Program
4	Residential Treatment Center
1	Relative
1	Non Relative
4	Own Dwelling
1	Diagnostic Center
2	Runaway (LA)

In 53 of the 81 cases reviewed the children/youths were placed in their home jurisdiction in settings that were in close proximity to their communities which allowed for the continuity of services.

The local board agreed with the department's placement plan for 79 of the 81 cases reviewed.

### Placement Stability

In 47 of the 81 cases reviewed there was a placement change within the 12 months prior to the review. 9 cases had 1 placement change, 26 cases had 2 changes, 5 cases had 3 changes and 7 cases had four or more changes.

The local department held a family involvement meeting for the placement changes for 14 of the 47 cases.

The following levels of care were found for the 47 most recent placement changes:

- 14 case(s) were less restrictive placements
- 12 case(s) were more restrictive placements
- 19 case(s) had the same level of care
- 2 case(s) were runaway

The primary positive reason for the most recent placement changes:

- 13 case(s) were transitioning towards permanency goal
- 2 case(s) placement with relatives

Provider specific issues for the most recent placement changes included:

- 3 case(s) provider home closed
- 3 case(s) provider request
- 1 case(s) was an allegation of provider abuse/neglect
- 2 case(s) were an incompatible match between child/youth and the providers

Child/youth specific issues for the most recent placement changes included:

- 21 case(s) behavioral issues
- 1 case(s) child/youth request removal
- 2 case(s) runaway

Were adequate services provided to support the provider in the previous placements?

- Yes, for 45 of the 47 cases

Current placement match between child's needs and the provider's ability to meet those needs:

- Yes, for 45 of the 47 cases

### Health/Mental Health

➤ Developmental/Special Needs: The local department reported that 15 of the 81 children/youths reviewed had developmental or special needs.

- Current Physical: 57 children/youths had a current physical exam.
- Current Vision: 51 children/youths had a current vision exam.
- Current Dental: 45 children/youths had a current dental exam.
- Follow-up Health Concerns: The local department ensured that appropriate follow-ups occurred on all health concerns noted by a physician for 4 of the 11 children/youths requiring follow-ups.
- Completed Medical Records: The local departments reported that 30 of the 81 children/youths had completed medical records in their case files.
- Prescription Medication: 35 children/youths were taking prescription medication.
- Prescription Medication Monitored: Prescription medication was being monitored regularly for the 35 children/youths.
- Psychotropic Medication: 27 children/youths were taking psychotropic medication.
- Psychotropic Medication Monitored: Psychotropic medication was being monitored at least quarterly for the 27 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues: 55 children/youths had mental health issues.
- Mental Health Diagnosis: 55 children/youths had a mental health diagnosis.
- Mental Health Issues Addressed: Yes, for 41 of the 55 children/youths.
- Mental Health Issues/Transitioning/Services: 2 youths with mental health issues who were transitioning out of care had an identified plan to receive services in the adult mental health system and 7 youths did not have a plan.
- Substance Abuse: 12 children/youths had a substance abuse problem.
- Substance Abuse Addressed: Yes, for 2 of the 12 children/youths.
- Behavioral Issues: 40 children/youths had behavioral issues.
- Behavioral Issues Addressed: Yes, for 31 of the 40 children/youths.

The local board found that the health needs of 32 of the 81 children/youths had been met and 12 children/youths refused to comply with standard health exams.

## Education

58 of the 81 children/youths reviewed were enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program. 51 of the 58 were in Pre-K thru 12th grade, 1 youth was enrolled in a GED program, 5 were in college and 1 was in a trade school. 9 of the 23 children/youth not enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had already graduated high school, 9 refused to attend school and 5 were under the age of 5.

30 of the 58 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program had a 504 or IEP plan and 18 had a copy of the 504/IEP plan in the child/youth's record.

A current progress report/report card was available for review for 36 of the 58 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program.

The local board agreed that 55 of the 58 children/youths enrolled in school or another educational/vocational program were being appropriately prepared to meet educational goals.

## Ready By 21

### ➤ Employment (age 14 and older – 59 cases)

21 of the 59 youths were employed or participating in paid or unpaid work experience. 1 youth was unable to participate due to mental health issues.

The local board agreed that 36 youths were being appropriately prepared to meet employment goals.

### ➤ Independent Living Services (age 14 and older – 59 cases)

The local board agreed that 35 of the 59 youths were receiving appropriate services to prepare for independent living. 1 youth was not receiving appropriate services due to mental health reasons.

### ➤ Housing (Transitioning Youth – 13 cases)

(Age 20 and/or planning to discharge within a year from the review)

Housing had been specified for 5 of the 13 youths transitioning out of care.

The local board agreed that 9 youths were being appropriately prepared to transition out of care.

## Child's Consent to Adoption

The age of consent for adoption in the State of Maryland is 10. Children 10 and older must consent to be adopted. Of the 7 cases with a plan of adoption 6 children were under the age of consent and 1 consented.

## Adoptive Placement Services and Resources (7 cases)

### Pre-Adoptive Placement (7 cases)

6 of the 7 children/youths with an adoption plan were placed in pre-adoptive homes. The pre-adoptive family structure was comprised of a married couple in 2 cases, a single female in 3 cases and a single male in 1 case. The relationships to the pre-adoptive children/youths were relative foster parents in 2 cases and non relative foster parents in 4 cases.

Lengths of time in the pre-adoptive placements were as follows:

- 4 case(s) from 16 to 20 months
- 2 case(s) from 21 months or more

A home study was completed and approved for 4 of the 6 cases.

The local board agreed that appropriate services and supports were in place for the pre-adoptive families to meet the identified needs of the children/youths in all 6 cases.

The local board agreed that the pre-adoptive placements were appropriate for all 6 cases.

### Adoptive Recruitment (1 case)

The local board found that the local department had documented efforts to find an adoptive resource for the 1 child/youth not placed in a pre-adoptive home. The adoptive resources were Adopting Together, Wendy's Wonderful Kids, Ready & Waiting, Digital Me and Adopt-Us-Kids.

The local board agreed that the adoptive recruitment efforts were appropriate for the 1 case.

### Post-Adoptive Services and Resources (7 cases)

Post adoptive services were needed for all 7 children/youths. The services that were needed were medical for all 7 cases.

The local board found that the post adoptive services were appropriate for the 7 cases.

### Miscellaneous Findings

#### Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

3 of the 81 cases had a CASA.

#### Risk and Safety

The local board agreed that safety and risk protocols were followed for 76 of the 81 cases.

### Child Visits with Parents, Relatives and Siblings

Child Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	35	16
No	46	65

Frequency of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Daily	1	
Once a week	12	3
More than once a week	2	1
Once a month	2	3
More than once a month	9	3
Quarterly		
Yes, but undocumented	9	6

Supervision of Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
Supervised	11	3
Unsupervised	24	13

Who Supervises Visits	With Parents	With Relatives
LDSS Agency Representative	9	2
Other Agency Representative		1
Biological Family Member	1	
Foster Parent		
Other	1	

Where do Visits Occur ?	With Parents	With Relatives
Parent/Relative Home	13	8
LDSS Visitation Center	6	1
Public Area	6	4
Child's/Youth's Placement	9	1
Other	1	2

Overnight Stays	With Parents	With Relatives
Yes	8	1
No	27	15

The local board found that 36 of the 81 children/youths had siblings in care. 20 had 1 sibling, 13 had 2 siblings and 3 had 3 siblings.

#### Barriers/Issues

The local board identified the following barriers to permanency or issues:

- No service agreement with parents.
- No service agreement with youth.
- No concurrent plan by court
- Non-compliant with service agreement.
- Missing or lack of documentation.
- Not following up on referrals.
- Board does not agree with current permanency plan.
- Annual physicals not current.
- Dentals not current.
- Vision not current.
- Child has behavior problems in the home.
- Child/Youth has runaway history.
- Other agency related barrier.
- Other independence barrier.
- Other education barrier.
- Other physical health barrier.
- Other mental health barrier.
- No follow up on medical referrals.
- Inadequate preparation for independence (general).
- Youth not attending school or in GED program.
- Transitional housing has not been identified.
- Non-compliant with service agreement.
- Youth placed outside of home jurisdiction.
- Youth refuses mental health treatment including therapy.
- Youth non-compliant with medication.

### Summary

Based on the findings of the review the local board determined that the local Department of Social Services made adequate progress towards a permanent placement (COMAR – 07.01.06.05 (F)) for 60 of the 81 children/youths reviewed.

The following are reminders of the materials required in accordance with the work plan agreement created between the Department of Human Resources (DHR), Social Services Administration and the Citizens Review Board for Children.

- Each (LDSS) is required to continue to bring the child's complete case records and/or records containing requested supportive documentation to all CRBC case reviews.
- Each (LDSS) should continue supplying CRBC with the most recent and current contact information for all interested parties, including professionals and family members.

#### Recommendations to All Local Departments of Social Services (LDSS)

- Each (LDSS) should encourage the attendance of children and youth who are 10 years of age and older to attend his/her scheduled CRBC case review.
- Each (LDSS) should encourage foster parent attendance at scheduled CRBC case reviews.
- Each (LDSS) should improve their efforts with documenting concurrent permanency plans.
- Each (LDSS) should improve their efforts with getting parents to sign service agreements for those children/youths with a permanency plan of reunification.
- Each (LDSS) is required to include the paternal family members as possible resources for all children/youths who are in out-of-home-placement care.

#### Independent Living

- Each (LDSS) is required to improve their efforts with preparing youths that have a plan of APPLA to meet their employment goals.

#### Permanent Connections

- Each (LDSS) is encouraged to improve their efforts with identifying permanent connections for those youths with a plan of APPLA.

#### Adoption

- Each (LDSS) should ensure that age appropriate children/youths with a permanency plan of adoption are linked with adoption counseling services.

1st Quarter 2020 CRBC Metrics

Total # of Children - Scheduled on the Preliminary:	575
Total # of Children - Closed, Non Submission & Rescheduled:	248
Total # of Children - Eligible for Review:	327
Total # of Children - Reviewed at the Board:	296
Total # of Children - Not Reviewed at the Board:	31
Percentage of Children Reviewed for the Period:	91%
Percentage of Children Not Reviewed for the Period:	9%
Recommendation Reports - Number Sent	282
Recommendation Reports - Number Sent on Time	282
Recommendation Reports - Percent Sent on Time	100%
Recommendation Reports - Number Received – DSS Response	138
Recommendation Reports - Percent Received % - DSS Response	49%
Recommendation Reports - Number Received on Time - DSS Response	33
Recommendation Reports - Percent Received on Time % - DSS Response	24%
Number of Boards Held	42
Recommendation Reports - # of DSS Agreement	137
Recommendation Reports - Percent of DSS Agreement	99%
Recommendation Reports - # of DSS Disagreement	1
Recommendation Reports - Percent of DSS Disagreement	0%
Recommendation Reports - # Blank/Unanswered	0
Recommendation Reports - Percent # Blank/Unanswered	0%
Percentage of REUNIFICATION Children Reviewed for the Period:	37%
Percentage of RELATIVE PLACEMENT – Adoption Children Reviewed:	2%
Percentage of RELATIVE PLACEMENT – C & G Children Reviewed:	4%
Percentage of ADOPTION Children Reviewed for the Period:	18%
Percentage of CUSTODY/GUARDIANSHIP Children Reviewed for the Period:	9%
Percentage of APPLA Children Reviewed for the Period:	30%

The State Board

Dr. Theresa Stafford

Circuit 1: Representing Dorchester, Somerset, Wicomico, and Worcester Counties

Reginald Groce Sr.

Circuit 2: Representing Caroline, Cecil, Kent, Queen Anne, and Talbot Counties

Delores Alexander (Vice Chairperson)

Circuit 3: Representing Baltimore and Harford Counties

Nettie Anderson-Burrs (Chairperson)

Circuit 4: Representing Allegany, Garrett, and Washington Counties

Vacant

Circuit 5: Representing Anne Arundel, Carroll, and Howard Counties

Sandra "Kay" Farley

Circuit 6: Representing Frederick and Montgomery Counties

Davina Richardson

Circuit 7: Representing Calvert, Charles, Prince George's, and St. Mary's Counties

Beatrice Lee

Circuit 8: Representing Baltimore City

Rita Jones

Circuit 8: Representing Baltimore City

Sarah Walker

Circuit 8: Representing Baltimore City

CRBC Staff

Denise E. Wheeler  
Administrator

Crystal Young, MSW  
Assistant Administrator

Jerome Findlay  
Information Technology Officer

Hope Smith  
IT Functional Analyst

Fran Barrow  
Child Welfare Specialist

Michele Foster, MSW  
Child Welfare Specialist

Marlo Palmer-Dixon, M.P.A  
Child Welfare Specialist

Sandy Colea  
Volunteer Activities Coordinator

Cindy Hunter-Gray  
Lead Secretary

## References

Citizens Review Board for Children (2013). Policy and Procedures Manual. Baltimore, MD: Department of Human Resources.

COMAR 07.02.11.01. Purpose of Out-of-Home Placement Program. Title 07 Department of Human Resources.

COMAR 07.01.06.05. Procedures for Conducting the Citizen Review of Out-of-Home Placement. Title 07 Department of Human Resources.

COMAR 07.02.11.03. Out of Home Placement: Definitions. Title 07 Department of Human Resources.

COMAR 07.02.11.08. Out of Home Placement: Medical Care. Title 07 Department of Human Resources.

COMAR 07.02.12.04. Post Adoption Services. Title 07 Department of Human Resources. Family

Law §5-539

Family Law §5-545

Maryland Department of Human Resources (2013). State Stats.

Social Security Administration (2013). Out of Home Placement Services – Ready By 21 Manual (FY2014 Edition). Baltimore, MD: Department of Human Resources.

Social Security Administration #12-32 (April 15, 2012). Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA). Baltimore, MD: Department of Human Resources.

Social Security Administration #14-17 (April 15, 2014). Oversight and Monitoring of Health Care Services. Baltimore, MD: Department of Human Resources.

Social Security Administration (2010). Out of Home Placement Program Manual. Baltimore, MD: Department of Human Resources.

Social Security Administration #10-08 (August 14, 2009). Family Involvement Meetings

(FIM). Baltimore, MD: Department of Human Resources.

Issued - Pursuant to Family Law Article Section §5-539.1(b)(3)