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Purpose

The Quarterly Indicators Report highlights trends in essential Philadelphia Department of Human Services (DHS) and Community Umbrella Agency (CUA) functions, key outcomes, and progress toward the four primary goals of Improving Outcomes for Children (IOC):

- More children and youth maintained safely in their own homes and communities
- A reduction in the use of congregate care
- More children and youth achieving timely reunification or other permanence
- Improved child, youth, and family functioning
Executive Summary

**Strengths**

- **More reports screened out than accepted for investigation.** Nearly 1,000 more reports have been screened out than accepted for investigation in Fiscal Year 2019.

- **More cases closed than accepted for service.** There were nearly 700 more cases closed than opened through Quarter 3 of Fiscal Year 2019.

- **Emphasis on kinship care and decrease in congregate care.** More than half (56%) of the youth in family foster care on March 31, 2019 were in kinship care, and only 10% of dependent youth in placement were in congregate care. Over the last four years, the delinquent congregate care population has declined by 64%.

- **Many youth live close to home.** Nearly two thirds (62%) of youth in kinship care or foster care on March 31, 2019 lived within 5 miles of their home, and most (86%) lived within 10 miles. This is a slight increase from Fiscal Year 2019 Quarter 2.
Executive Summary

Areas for Improvement

• **Caseloads remain slightly higher than DHS’ goal.** CUA case management workers carry an average of 11 cases— a decrease from previous years, but higher than the DHS funded ratio of 1:10. CUA case management staff retention contributes to the slightly higher ratio at CUAs.

• **Ongoing challenges with adoption and PLC timeliness.** With the exception of the two-year PLC rate, adoption and PLC timeliness remain well below pre-IOC rates.
Focus Areas

1. Hotline and Investigations
2. Services
3. Permanency
Hotline and Investigations
I. Hotline

Call Volume

Figure 1. Total Hotline Reports

- Hotline reports have increased for every full fiscal year since FY15
- For the first time since 2015, there was a decrease in total Q1-Q3 Hotline reports from the year prior
Hotline Decisions

Figure 2. Total Screen Outs

The total number of screen outs continues to increase, though the increase from FY18 Q3 to FY19 Q3 was smaller than in previous years.

There were more than twice as many screen outs through FY19 Q3 as there were through FY16 Q3.

Hotline Administrators review monthly samples of screened out reports to ensure the screen outs are appropriate.

Data run on 5/4/2019
Note: Current CWIS referral type definitions were implemented at the beginning of calendar year 2015.
I. Hotline

Hotline Decisions

Figure 3. Secondary Screen Outs

- Just under half (49%) of secondary screen out cases were sent to Intake during the first half of Fiscal Year 2019
- Over a third of the cases (34%) were screened out; 25% were screened out after deployment, and 9% were screened out at initial review
- Nearly one in five (17%) reports were sent to Prevention

DHS created the Secondary Screen Out process in late Summer 2017 to review GPS reports with a 3-7 day priority that were accepted for investigation and were not assessed as present or impending danger. The Safe Diversion protocol may confirm the decision to screen out a case after an initial review (with or without prevention services) or the unit may deploy a Hotline worker for screening. Deployed Hotline workers may choose to send a case to Intake for investigation or screen it out.

Data run on 5/6/2019
• Continuing the trend from FY18, there were fewer investigations through FY19 Q3 than through FY18 Q3.

Data run on 5/4/2019
Hotline Decisions

Figure 5. Hotline Action

- Half (50%) of all reports were screened out through FY19 Q3
- Just under half (47%) of all reports were accepted for investigation through FY19 Q3
- Nearly 1,000 more reports have been screened out than accepted for investigation through FY19 Q3

Data run on 5/4/2019

*Other reports include referrals for law enforcement only, other jurisdictions, information only, and follow-up on a prior report
Services
Dependent Youth Demographics – Mar. 31, 2019

### Figure 6. Sex
- Male: 50%
- Female: 50%

N=8,852

- As of 3/31/19, the sex of dependent youth was evenly split

### Figure 7. Age
- Under 5: 35%
- 5-10: 23%
- 11-17: 36%
- 18+: 6%

N=8,855

- Just over half (58%) of dependent youth in care on 3/31/19 were 10 years old or younger

### Figure 8. Race/Ethnicity
- Black: 69%
- Latino: 17%
- White: 12%
- Multiple: 2%
- Unable to Determine: 0%
- Other: 1%

N=8,855

- Over two thirds (69%) of dependent youth on 3/31/19 identified as Black
- Approximately 1 in 6 (17%) were Latino

Data run on 5/4/2019
*Sample size discrepancy is the result of unreported gender
III. Services

Cases Accepted for Service and Cases Closed

Figure 9. Cases Accepted and Closed by Month

Figure 10. Cases Accepted and Closed by Fiscal Year

- There have been more cases closed than opened each month in Fiscal Year 2019
- There were nearly 500 fewer cases accepted for service in FY19 Q3 than in FY18 Q3
- There were 671 more cases closed than accepted for service in FY19

Data run on 4/30/2019
*Case closed or transferred to Non-CWO Services (Delinquent or Subsidy)
There were just over 5,000 cases open on March 31, 2019—fewer cases than in the past four years.

- There were 11% fewer cases open on March 31, 2019 than there were on March 31, 2018
- There were 16% fewer cases open on March 31, 2019 than there were on March 31, 2016
In-Home Services

There was a 23% decrease in both the number of cases and children receiving in-home services from 3/31/18 to 3/31/19.

Data run on 4/29/2019
III. Services

In-Home Services

Figure 14. Length of In-Home Safety Services on Mar. 31, 2019

- As of 3/31/19, 60% of in-home safety youth had been in service for less than 6 months

N=1,155

Figure 15. Length of In-Home Non-Safety Services on Mar. 31, 2019

- As of 3/31/19, 43% of in-home non-safety youth had been in service for less than 6 months

N=2,053
Dependent Placement Services

Figure 16. Total Cases with Placement Services

- Compared to 3/31/18, the total number of placement cases and youth on 3/31/19 declined by 16% and 9%, respectively
- CUA continued to manage about 95% of placement cases and placement youth

Figure 17. Total Children with Placement Services

Data run on 5/4/2019
DHS cases include those receiving services from the Ongoing Services Region (OSR), Adoption, and Special Investigations teams
III. Services

Dependent Placements

*Figure 18. Dependent Placements on Mar. 31st of Each Year*

- The percentage of youth in kinship care has remained steady since 3/31/16
- The percentage of youth in congregate care continues to decline and remained below the national average (12%)
- The total number of youth in placement declined by 10% from 3/31/18 to 3/31/19

Data Run on 5/4/2019
Congregate Care national average was calculated by aggregating national institution and group home totals reported in AFCARS Reports.
III. Services

Dependent Placement Services

Figure 19. Children in Dependent Placements on Mar. 31, 2019 by Placement Type

- A large majority (87%) of youth in placement on 3/31/19 were in family foster care
- Approximately 1 in 10 (10%) youth in placement on 3/31/19 were in congregate care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Foster Care</td>
<td>4,834</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregate Care</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised Independent Living</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=5,581

Data run on 5/4/2019
*Pending youths’ service information had yet to be entered into the electronic database as of the date the data were run*
More than half (56%) of family foster care youth were in kinship care on 3/31/19.
Dependent Placement Services

Figure 21. Children in Dependent Congregate Care on Mar. 31, 2019

- Nearly half (44%) of congregate care youth were in a group home, and 17% were in a CBH-funded RTF on 3/31/2019.
Since March 31, 2015 there has been a 34% drop in the total number of dependent youth in congregate care settings.

Dependent congregate care placements have decreased each year since 2015.
Delinquent Youth Demographics – Mar. 31, 2019

Figure 23. Sex

- As of 3/31/19, nearly 9 in 10 (89%) delinquent youth were male

Figure 24. Age

- Almost two thirds (66%) of delinquent youth were between the ages of 16 and 18 years old

Figure 25. Race/Ethnicity

- About 8 in 10 (77%) delinquent youth identified as Black
- Approximately 1 in 6 (18%) were Latino

Data run on 5/4/2019

*Sample size discrepancy is the result of unreported gender and birth date
III. Services

Delinquent Placement Services

Figure 26. Children in Delinquent Placements on Mar. 31, 2019 by Placement Type

- Three in four (75%) youth in delinquent placements were in congregate care.
- Of the 446 youth in a delinquent placement, 103 (23%) were housed at the Philadelphia Juvenile Justice Service Center (PJJSC).

![Pie chart showing delinquent placements]

N=446

Data run on 5/4/2019

“Other community placements” include foster care and supervised independent living.

Alternatives to placement for children in Juvenile Justice exist which are not included above because those contracts are not managed by DHS (evening reporting center as an example).
III. Services

Delinquent Placement Services

*Figure 27. Children in Delinquent Congregate Care on Mar. 31, 2019*

- Three in five (60%) delinquent youth in congregate care were in a non-RTF institution.
- Nearly a third (31%) of youth in delinquent congregate care were in a state institution.

**Pie Chart:**
- Group Home: 2% (6)
- Non-RTF Institution: 31% (104)
- CBH-Funded RTF: 7% (22)
- State Institution: 60% (202)

N=334

Data run on 1/14/2019
Since March 31, 2015, there has been a 64% decrease in the total number of delinquent youth in congregate care settings.

Delinquent congregate care placements have decreased each year since 2015.
### Family Foster Care Distance From Home

**Figure 29. Distance from Home for CUA Youth in Family Foster Care as of Mar. 31, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUA</th>
<th>0-2 miles</th>
<th>2-5 miles</th>
<th>5-10 miles</th>
<th>10+ miles</th>
<th>Unable to Determine Distance*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 - NET (N=425)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 - APM (N=537)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 - TPFC (N=538)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 - CCS (N=353)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 - TPFC (N=710)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 - TABOR (N=339)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 - NET (N=395)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 - BETH (N=318)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 - TPFC (N=457)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – TPFC (N=488)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A majority (62%) of family foster care youth lived within 5 miles of their home of origin, and 86% lived within 10 miles

---

Data run on 5/3/2019
Invalid home addresses include those outside of Philadelphia or incomplete addresses that could not be geocoded. Distances were calculated using ArcMap 10.6 GIS Software.
### Congregate Care Distance from Home

**Table 1. Distance between Dependent Congregate Care Youth and City Limits as of Mar. 31, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th># of Facilities</th>
<th># of Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Philadelphia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 5 Miles</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10 Miles</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 25 Miles</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 50 Miles</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ Miles</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td><strong>574</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Over two thirds (70%) of all dependent youth in congregate care were either in Philadelphia or within 10 miles of the city limits.

---

Data run on 5/3/2019

A facility is defined as an agency site. Therefore, if an agency has a campus with separately designated buildings/cottages with their own street address they are counted uniquely.
### Congregate Care Distance from Home

**Table 2. Distance between Delinquent Congregate Care Youth and City Limits as of Mar. 31, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th># of Facilities</th>
<th># of Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Philadelphia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 5 Miles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10 Miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 25 Miles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 50 Miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ Miles</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>334</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Nearly one third (31%) of delinquent congregate care youth were placed between 10 and 25 miles of Philadelphia city limits.
- Nearly two thirds (65%) of delinquent congregate care youth were placed at least 50 miles from the city limits.

---

Data run on 5/3/2019

A facility is defined as an agency site. Therefore, if an agency has a campus with separately designated buildings/cottages with their own street address they are counted uniquely.
### III. Services

#### Caseload

**Table 3. CUA Case Management Workers’ Caseload Distribution on Mar. 31, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUA</th>
<th>Total workers</th>
<th>Total cases</th>
<th>Median caseload</th>
<th>Average caseload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 – NET</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 – APM</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 – TPFC</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 – CCS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 – TPFC</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 – TABOR</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 – NET</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 – BETH</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 – TP4C</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – TPFC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>432</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,637</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4. DHS Ongoing Service Region Case Management Workers’ Caseload Distribution on Mar. 31, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DHS</th>
<th>Total workers</th>
<th>Total cases</th>
<th>Median caseload</th>
<th>Average caseload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSR</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data run on 5/3/2019

Cases that did not have a case manager designated in the electronic database at the time the data were run were excluded from the analysis.

- CUA had an average caseload of slightly under 11 cases per worker while DHS had a caseload closer to 10
- Turning Points for Children-10 had the lowest average caseload (9.1), and APM had the highest (13.1)
Monthly Visitation

**Figure 30. DHS and CUA Visitation Rates by Month**

- Both CUA and DHS maintained visitation rates at or above 94% in calendar year 2019
- In April 2019, CUAs had an average visitation rate of 96%, which was the highest rate in the past year
• 9 of 10 CUAs had visitation rates of at least 90% for all of FY19 Q3

• CUAs 1, 4 and 7 maintained visitation rates above 95%
Permanency
IV. Permanency

Permanency Rates and Totals

Figure 32. Permanency Rates by CUA

- The system wide permanency rate was 21.4% for the first three quarters of FY 19

Figure 33. Permanency Totals by Permanency Type

- Nearly half (47%) of FY19 Q3 permanencies were reunifications
- FY19 permanencies are on track to match or exceed FY18 totals

Data run on 5/15/2019

**The DHS permanency rate only includes youth for whom DHS was providing case management services – Based on unreconciled data from PFDS database**
### Permanency Timeliness

**Figure 34. Timeliness of Permanency**

- **Reunification rates have remained consistent over the past five fiscal years and into FY19 Q3**
  - Reunification within 1 year:
    - FY15: 50%
    - FY16: 60%
    - FY17: 60%
    - FY18: 59%
    - FY19 Q1-Q3: 60%

- **The rate for adoption within two years has been stable since FY16**
  - Adoption within 2 years:
    - FY15: 53%
    - FY16: 47%
    - FY17: 45%
    - FY18: 37%
    - FY19 Q1-Q3: 39%

- **The rate for PLC within two years rose slightly from FY18 to FY19 Q3, but the three-year rate declined**
  - PLC within 2 years:
    - FY15: 29%
    - FY16: 29%
    - FY17: 29%
    - FY18: 21%
    - FY19 Q1-Q3: 28%
  - PLC within 3 years:
    - FY15: 77%
    - FY16: 64%
    - FY17: 70%
    - FY18: 62%
    - FY19 Q1-Q3: 56%

Data run on 5/15/2019
Questions?