

Citizens Review Board For Children



**FIRST QUARTER
FISCAL 2016 REPORT
(July 1st 2015 - September 30th 2015)**

Table of Contents

Our Mission Statement	3
Our Vision Statement	3
Discrimination Statement.....	3
Confidentiality.....	3
CRBC Acknowledgements	4
Introduction	5
Targeted Review Criterion.....	6
Permanency Plan Hierarchy.....	8
Family Centered Practice Model.....	8
1st Quarter Case Review Statistics.....	8
Gender Totals.....	9
Gender By Plan.....	9
Ethnicity Overall.....	10
Case Review Totals by Jurisdictional Size	10
Large Jurisdictions:.....	10
Baltimore County	11
Montgomery County.....	12
Prince Georges County	13
Baltimore City	14
Medium Jurisdictions:	15
Allegany County.....	15
Anne Arundel County.....	16
Cecil County	17
Charles County	18
Frederick County.....	19
Harford County.....	20
Saint Mary’s County.....	21
Washington County.....	22
Small Jurisdictions:.....	23
Calvert County.....	23
Wicomico County	24
Required Supporting Documentation.....	25
Recommendations to All LDSS	25
The State Board.....	27
CRBC Staff	28
References	29

Our Mission Statement

To conduct case reviews of children in out-of-home care case reviews, 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


The Citizens Review Board for Children (CRBC) as always would like to take the time to acknowledge those who make its mission work! The CRBC program is extremely grateful to all of the people who remain committed to making an effort to keep Maryland's children safe and protected against abuse and neglect.

- ★ CRBC Governor Appointed Volunteers
- ★ The Maryland Department of Human Resources (DHR) and the Social Services Administration (SSA).
- ★ All 24 Local Departments of Social Services
- ★ The Circuit Courts of Maryland
- ★ The Coalition to Protect Maryland's Children

*Thank
You*

Introduction

The Citizens Review Board for Children (CRBC) is proud to release its 1st Quarter Fiscal 2016 Report. The following pages contain data from CRBC's out-of-home-placement case review findings, and recommendations.



CRBC conducts regular out-of-home placement case reviews in all 24 Maryland jurisdictions including Baltimore City throughout the year. In this quarterly report, the following counties did not have regularly scheduled case reviews during the quarter: Caroline, Carroll, Dorchester, Garrett, Howard, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot, and Worcester counties. Therefore, this report only contains review findings and recommendations for the other 13 counties and 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 guardianship
- Adoption by 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 Case Review Statistics

Jurn #	County	Reunification	Relative Placement	Adoption	Guardianship	APPLA	TOTAL
01	Allegany	2	0	1	2	2	7
02	Anne Arundel	1	0	6	0	5	12
03	Baltimore County	9	0	7	2	14	32
04	Calvert	1	0	0	0	3	4
07	Cecil	8	0	1	0	4	13
08	Charles	2	0	2	0	1	5
10	Frederick	0	0	3	0	3	6
12	Harford	1	1	10	0	6	18
15	Montgomery	8	0	6	0	29	43
16	Prince Georges	12	0	0	5	13	30
18	Saint Mary's	4	0	3	0	1	8
21	Washington	0	0	5	0	11	16
22	Wicomico	0	0	0	0	2	2
49	Baltimore City	23	6	22	0	51	102
	Statewide Totals	71	7	66	9	145	298
	Percentages	24%	2%	22%	3%	49%	100%



CRBC conducted a total of 298 individual out-of-home case reviews in the 1st quarter of fiscal 2016.

Total Reviewed (298)

Gender Totals

Male	Female
148 (49.6%)	150 (50.3%)

Gender By Plan

Male(148):

Reunification	Relative Placement	Adoption	Guardianship	APPLA
33 (22.3%)	5 (3.4%)	33 (22.3%)	5 (3.4%)	72 (48.6%)

Female(150):


Reunification	Relative Placement	Adoption	Guardianship	APPLA
38 (25.3%)	2 (1.3%)	33 (22.0%)	4 (2.7%)	73 (48.7%)

Ethnicity Overall (298)

African American	Caucasian	Asian	Other
176 (59.1%)	111 (37.2%)	2 (0.7%)	9 (3.0%)

The Department of Human Resources (DHR) groups jurisdictions according to caseload size, placing them into large, medium, and small groups.


Case Review Totals by Jurisdictional size



There were a total of 207 (69.5%) cases reviewed in the large jurisdictions, 85 (28.5%) cases reviewed in the medium jurisdictions, and 6 (2.0%) cases reviewed in the small jurisdictions.

LARGE JURISDICTIONS							
Jurn #	County	Reunification	Relative Placement	Adoption	Guardianship	APPLA	TOTAL
03	Baltimore County	9	0	7	2	14	32
15	Montgomery	8	0	6	0	29	43
16	Prince Georges	12	0	0	5	13	30
49	Baltimore City	23	6	22	0	51	102
Totals		52	6	35	7	107	207
Percentages		25%	3%	17%	3%	52%	100%
**Large: 500 cases or more per jurisdiction							

Baltimore County



There were a total of 32 out-of-home-placement case reviews conducted in Baltimore County.


Baltimore County Reunification case reviews made up (28.1%) of the 32 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Baltimore County Adoption case reviews made up (21.9%) of the 32 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Baltimore County Guardianship case reviews made up (6.3%) of the 32 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Baltimore County APPLA case reviews made up (43.7%) of the 32 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Montgomery County




There were a total of 43 out-of-home-placement case reviews conducted in Montgomery County.

Montgomery County Reunification case reviews made up (18.6%) of the 43 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Montgomery County Adoption case reviews made up (14.0%) of the 43 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Montgomery County APPLA case reviews made up (67.4%) of the 43 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Prince George's County




There were a total of 30 out-of-home-placement case reviews conducted in Prince Georges County.

Prince Georges County Reunification case reviews made up (40.0%) of the 30 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Prince Georges County Guardianship case reviews made up (16.7%) of the 30 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Prince Georges County APPLA case reviews made up (43.3%) of the 30 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Baltimore City



There were a total of 102 out-of-home-placement case reviews conducted in Baltimore City.

Baltimore City Reunification case reviews made up (22.5%) of the 102 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Baltimore City Relative Placement case reviews made up (5.9%) of the 102 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.


Baltimore City Adoption case reviews made up (21.6%) of the 102 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Baltimore City APPLA case reviews made up (50.0%) of the 102 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

MEDIUM JURISDICTIONS							
Jurn #	County	Reunification	Relative Placement	Adoption	Guardianship	APPLA	TOTAL
01	Allegany	2	0	1	2	2	7
02	Anne Arundel	1	0	6	0	5	12
07	Cecil	8	0	1	0	4	13
08	Charles	2	0	2	0	1	5
10	Frederick	0	0	3	0	3	6
12	Harford	1	1	10	0	6	18
18	Saint Mary's	4	0	3	0	1	8
21	Washington	0	0	5	0	11	16
Totals		18	1	31	2	33	85
Percentages		21%	1%	36%	2%	39%	100%

****Medium: 300 to 500 cases per jurisdiction**

Allegany County



There were a total of 7 out-of-home-placement case reviews conducted in Allegany County.


Allegany County Reunification case reviews made up (28.6%) of the 7 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Allegany County Adoption case reviews made up (14.2%) of the 7 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Allegany County Guardianship case reviews made up (28.6%) of the 7 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Allegany County APPLA case reviews made up (28.6%) of the 7 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Anne Arundel County




There were a total of 12 out-of-home-placement case reviews conducted in Anne Arundel County.

Anne Arundel County Reunification case reviews made up (8.3%) of the 12 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Anne Arundel County Adoption case reviews made up (50.0%) of the 12 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Anne Arundel County APPLA case reviews made up (41.7%) of the 12 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Cecil County




There were a total of 13 out-of-home-placement cases reviews conducted in Cecil County.

Cecil County Reunification case reviews made up (61.5%) of the 13 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Cecil County Adoption case reviews made up (7.7%) of the 13 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Cecil County APPLA case reviews made up (30.8%) of the 13 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Charles County




There were a total of 5 out-of-home-placement case reviews conducted in Charles County.

Charles County Reunification case reviews made up (40.0%) of the 5 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Charles County Adoption case reviews made up (40.0%) of the 5 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Charles County APPLA case reviews made up (20.0%) of the 5 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

FREDERICK COUNTY




There were a total of 6 out-of-home-placement case reviews conducted in Frederick County.

Frederick County Adoption case reviews made up (50.0%) of the 6 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Frederick County APPLA case reviews made up (50.0%) of the 6 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Harford County



There were a total of 18 out-of-home-placement case reviews conducted in Harford County.


Harford County Reunification case reviews made up (5.6%) of the 18 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Harford County Relative Placement case reviews made up (5.6%) of the 18 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Harford County Adoption case reviews made up (55.6%) of the 18 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Harford County APPLA case reviews made up (33.2%) of the 18 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Saint Mary's County




There were a total of 8 out-of-home-placement case reviews conducted in Saint Mary's County.

Saint Mary's County Reunification case reviews made up (50.0%) of the 8 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Saint Mary's County Adoption case reviews made up (37.5%) of the 8 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Saint Mary's County APPLA case reviews made up (12.5%) of the 8 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Washington County



There were a total of 16 out-of-home-placement case reviews conducted in Washington County.


Washington County Adoption case reviews made up (31.3%) of the 16 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Washington County APPLA case reviews made up (68.7%) of the 16 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

SMALL JURISDICTIONS							
Jurn #	County	Reunification	Relative Placement	Adoption	Guardianship	APPLA	TOTAL
04	Calvert	1	0	0	0	3	4
22	Wicomico	0	0	0	0	2	2
Totals		1	0	0	0	5	6
Percentages		17%	0%	0%	0%	83%	100%

****Small: less than 100 cases per jurisdiction**

Calvert County




There were a total of 4 out-of-home-placement case reviews conducted in Calvert County.

Calvert County Reunification case reviews made up (25%) of the 4 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Calvert County APPLA case reviews made up (75%) of the 4 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Wicomico County



There were a total of 2 out-of-home-placement case reviews conducted in Wicomico County.

Wicomico County APPLA case reviews made up (100%) of the 2 cases reviewed within the jurisdiction.

Required Supporting Documentation for CRBC Reviews

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 youth with a permanency plan of reunification.
- Each (LDSS) is required to include the paternal family members as possible resources for all youth who are in out-of-home-placement care.

Independent Living:

- Each (LDSS) is required to improve their efforts with preparing youth 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 youth with a plan of APPLA.

Adoption:

- Each (LDSS) should ensure that age appropriate youth with a permanency plan of Adoption are linked with adoption counseling services.

The State Board

Doretha Henry

Circuit 1: Representing Dorchester, Somerset, Wicomico, and Worcester Counties

Vacant

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

Heidi Busch

Circuit 5: Representing Anne Arundel, Carroll, and Howard Counties

Susan Gross

Circuit 6: Representing Frederick and Montgomery Counties

Denise Joseph

Circuit 7: Representing Calvert, Charles, Prince George's, and St. Mary's Counties

Sheila Jessup, PhD

Circuit 8: Representing Baltimore City

Sylvia Smith

Circuit 8: Representing Baltimore City

Sarah Walker

Circuit 8: Representing Baltimore City

CRBC Staff

Denise E. Wheeler
Administrator

Crystal Young, MSW
Assistant Administrator

Debbie Ramelmeier, LCSW-C, J.D.
Director of Child Welfare Policy

Jerome Findlay
IT Officer

Fran Barrow
Staff Assistant

Michele Foster, MSW
Staff Assistant

Eric Davis, MSW
Staff Assistant

Marlo Palmer-Dixon
Volunteer Specialist

Cindy Hunter-Gray
Lead Secretary

Desiree Gold
Clerk

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)