



# Quarterly Indicators Report

Fiscal Year 2022

July 1, 2021 – June 30, 2022



Office of  
**Children and Families**  
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

---

Department of Human Services

# 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: Progress towards right-sizing



**Fewer families are open for DHS services.** CUAs continued to close more cases than were opened in every month of Fiscal Year 2022 except for April.



**Fewer children re-enter foster care.** The percentage of youth who are reunified that re-enter foster care within one year has decreased every year since Fiscal Year 2018.



**Repeat maltreatment has decreased.** The percentage of children with an indicated CPS report in Fiscal Year 2021 who had a repeat indicated CPS report within one year (2.2%) was the lowest it has been since Fiscal Year 2014 and remains below the national average of 9.5%.



# Executive Summary

## Strengths: More children maintained in their own communities



**Emphasize placing children with kin.** More than half (52%) of the children and youth in dependent placement on June 30, 2022, were in kinship care.



**Fewer children and youth are in placement.** The number of children and youth in dependent out of home placement has decreased 36% from 5,997 children in June 2018 to 3,842 children in June 2022.

## Strengths: Safely reduce congregate care



**Decrease in congregate care.** By the end of FY22, 6.6% of dependent youth in placement were in congregate care, which is lower than the national average of 9.5%. There has been an 81% decline in youth in delinquent congregate care over the last five years.



# Executive Summary

## Areas of Focus: Increased youth in the Childcare Room and PJJSC



**Challenges Placing Youth.** There have been significant challenges finding dependent placements for youth, particularly older youth and those with behavioral health needs. This has led to increases in the number of youth utilizing the Childcare Room.



**More youth detained at the PJJSC.** The number of youth detained at the Philadelphia Juvenile Justice Services Center (PJJSC) has increased in FY22 from the previous fiscal year.



# Executive Summary

## Areas of Focus: Ongoing challenges with permanency



**Ongoing challenges with permanency.** Reunification, adoption and permanent legal custodianship timeliness have declined in the years following Improving Outcomes for Children (IOC) implementation (Fiscal Year 2015).

## Areas of Focus: Staff recruitment and retention



**Staff turnover at CUAs remains high.** Challenges with recruitment and turnover for CUA providers have been made worse by the Pandemic. DHS and CUA are engaged in multiple strategies to improve recruitment and retention at the CUAs.



# Content Areas

- 1 Hotline and Investigations
- 2 Dependent Services
- 3 Juvenile Justice Programs
- 4 Permanency
- 5 Spotlight Section: Childcare Room
- 6 Spotlight Section: Hotline Reports FY20-FY22




# Hotline and Investigations



## Call Volume


Figure 1. Total Hotline Reports



- After decreasing every fiscal year since FY18, Hotline reports increased from FY21 to FY22
- Hotline reports in FY22 increased by 19% from the previous fiscal year

# Hotline Decisions


Figure 2. Hotline Action



- Over half (55%) of all reports were screened out in FY22
  - This percentage is roughly equal to previous years
- Less than half (42%) of all reports were accepted for investigation in FY22

# Investigations

Figure 3. Total Investigations




- In FY22, 13,941 calls from Hotline were sent to investigation, which is 42% of total reports
- Investigations increased 12% from FY21 to FY22
  - Note: this was less than the 19% increase in Hotline reports. This difference demonstrates more families were screened out by Hotline

# Hotline Decisions

Figure 4. Fiscal Year 2022 Secondary Screen Outs

DHS created the Secondary Screen Out process in 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. Using the Safe Diversion protocol Hotline supervisors will screen out a case after an initial review (with or without Prevention services) or deploy a Hotline worker for screening. Deployed Hotline workers may choose to send a case to Intake for investigation or screen it out.



N= 4,179


- In FY22, 4,179 reports were sent to the secondary screen out unit
- Over half (58%) of secondary screen out reports were ultimately sent to Intake or Specialty Investigations
- Just over 1 in 4 (27%) reports were screened out either at initial review or after deployment of a Hotline staff
- One in 7 (15%) reports were referred to Prevention

Data run on 8/30/2022  
 \*Until FY22 Q2 the secondary screen out data was manually recorded and reported from this process. In FY22 Q3 DHS began using DHS" case management system, Philadelphia Family Data System (PFDS) to report the data.

# Repeat Maltreatment: Federal Measure

The federal measure for repeat maltreatment examines the percentage of children in a given fiscal year with an indicated CPS report who had another indicated report with 12 months.

Figure 5. Repeat Maltreatment: Federal Measure



- Of the 592 children with an indicated CPS report in FY21, 2.2% had a repeat indicated CPS report. This percentage remains below the national average of 9.5%


Data run on 8/30/2022

Because this measure looks forward in time, there is a one-year lag in reporting repeat maltreatment. National Average comes from CFSR Round 3 Statewide Data Indicator Series. Last updated in 2019. <https://capacity.childwelfare.gov/states/resources/cfsr-round-3-statewide-data-indicator-series-recurrence-of-maltreatment>

# Repeat Maltreatment: State Measure


The Pennsylvania measure for repeat maltreatment looks at the number of CPS reports received per year and identifies those children who **have ever had a previous indication of abuse**.

Figure 6. CPS Reports with Suspected Re-Abuse



- The rate of CPS reports with **suspected** re-abuse in FY22 was slightly less than last fiscal year, but remains higher than the PA state rate of 4.1%

Figure 7. Indicated CPS Reports with Re-Abuse



- The rate of CPS reports with **indicated** re-abuse in FY22 has decreased since FY18. However, it remains higher than the PA state rate of 5.2%

Data run on 8/30/2022

PA state rates were calculated using data from the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Kids Count Data Center. Last updated in July 2019. <https://datacenter.kidscount.org/data/tables/5088-child-abuse-and-reabuse-number-of-reported-and-substantiated-cases#detailed/2/any/false/37,871,870,573,869,36,868,867,133,38/1106,1107,1108,1110,1111/11521>



# Hotline and Investigations Summary

- In FY22, reports to the DHS Hotline of suspected abuse and neglect increased from the previous year, nearly returning to pre-COVID levels
- Like the increase in Hotline reports, the number of reports accepted for investigation also increased from the previous year
- While reports to Hotline and investigations increased proportionally, Hotline staff continued to screen out more reports and repeat maltreatment remained low

In summary, despite Hotline reports returning to pre-COVID levels, in an effort to right-size the system, Hotline staff continue to screen out more families reported than they accept for investigation

More information on why Hotline reports increased from FY21 to FY22 can be found on slides 78-84 of this document.




# Dependent Services



# Sex of Dependent Youth –June 30, 2022

Figure 8. Sex of All Dependent Youth




- As of 6/30/22, there were slightly more female children and youth than male children and youth with dependent services
- These percentages were consistent for youth in dependent placement and with in-home services

Data run on 8/3/2022  
\*Sample size discrepancy across sex, age, and race/ethnicity is the result of unreported sex and age

### Age of Dependent Youth – June 30, 2022


Figure 9. Age of All Dependent Youth



N=5,800

- Three in 5 (60%) dependent youth on 6/30/22 were under 11 years old


Figure 9a. Age of Dependent In-Home Youth



N=1,958

- On 6/30/22, 41% of dependent **in-home** youth were age 11 or older

Figure 9b. Age of Dependent Placement Youth




N=3,842

- On 6/30/22, 40% of **placement** youth were ages 11 or older

Data run on 8/3/2022  
\*Sample size discrepancy across sex, age, and race/ethnicity is the result of unreported sex and age


# Race/Ethnicity of Dependent Youth – June 30, 2022

Figure 10. Race/Ethnicity of All Dependent Youth




N=5,800

Figure 10a. Race/Ethnicity of Dependent In-Home Youth



N=1,958

Figure 10b. Race/Ethnicity of Dependent Placement Youth



N=3,842


Black Latino White Multiple Unable to Determine Other

- Nearly two thirds (65%) of dependent youth on 6/30/22 were Black and approximately 1 in 6 (18%) were Latino
- The proportion of Black and Latino youth with in-home and dependent placement services were roughly equal to dependent youth overall

Data run on 8/3/2022  
\*Sample size discrepancy across sex, age, and race/ethnicity is the result of unreported sex and age

# Families Accepted for Service and Families Closed

Figure 11. Families Accepted and Closed by Month




- More families were closed than accepted for service every month since July 2020 except June 2021 and April 2022

Data run on 8/3/2022

\*Families closed includes those transferred to Non-CWO Services (Delinquent or Subsidy)

## Families Referred and Families Closed


Figure 12. Families Referred and Closed in FY22, by CUA



- All CUAs closed more families in FY22 than were referred to them, with the exception of CUA 8, Bethanna
- CUA 2, APM, closed nearly twice as many families as they had referred to them in FY22, the greatest difference of any CUA

# Total Families Open for Service

Figure 13. Total Families Open for Service on June 30<sup>th</sup>



- There were 3,748 families open for service on June 30, 2022
- There were fewer families open at the end of FY22 than in the four previous years

Data run on 8/3/2022

### In-Home Services

Figure 14. Total **Families** with In-Home Services





Figure 15. Total **Children** with In-Home Services



- Compared to 6/30/21, the total number of families and children with-in home services on 6/30/22 both declined by 16%
- CUAs provided in-home services for 99% of all in-home families and children

### In-Home Services

Figure 16. Total **Families** with In-Home Services by Service Type





Figure 17. Total **Children** with In-Home Services by Service Type



- A slightly higher percentage of families had non-safety services on 6/30/22 (61%) than on 6/30/21 (57%)
- This was also true for children: 60% of children had non-safety services in 2022, compared to 55% in 2021


Data run on 8/3/2022

If families included multiple children, some with in-home safety services and others with non-safety services, that family is counted twice.




### In-Home Services

Figure 18. Length of In-Home **Safety** Services on June 30, 2022



- As of 6/30/22, 51% of youth with in-home safety services had been in service for less than 6 months

Figure 19. Length of In-Home **Non-Safety** Services on June 30, 2022



- As of 6/30/22, 53% of youth with in-home non-safety services had been in service for less than 6 months

Data run on 8/3/2022.  
Youth whose service information had yet to be entered into the electronic database are excluded from these figures.

### Dependent Placement Services

Figure 20. Total **Families** with Placement Services





Figure 21. Total **Children** with Placement Services




- Compared to 6/30/21, on 6/30/22 the total number of families with children in placement declined by 10%, and the total number of children declined by 11%
- CUA continued to manage services for almost all (98%) families and children with placement services

Data run on 8/3/2022.  
DHS cases include those receiving services from the Ongoing Services Region (OSR), Adoption, and Special Investigations teams

# Dependent Placements

Figure 22. Entry Rate of Children into Out of Home Care per 1,000 Philadelphia Children, by Federal Fiscal Year




- In FY21, the entry rate into out of home care was 4.3 per 1,000 children, higher than the national average of 2.9 per 1,000 children
- The rate of children entering out of home placement has decreased every year since FY17

Data run on 11/29/2021. The data will be updated in FY23 Q1. Data reflects the federal fiscal year which runs from 10/1 to 9/30. This was done so that DHS could compare data to other jurisdictions. National Average comparison was obtained from Casey Family Programs, calculated using data from the Adoption Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) and US Census.

# Dependent Placements

Figure 23. Dependent Placements on June 30<sup>th</sup> of Each Year




- Over half (52%) of all dependent placement youth were placed with kin as of 6/30/22
- The percentage of youth in congregated care continued to decline (6.6% on 6/30/22) and remained below the national average (9.5%)

Data Run on 8/3/2022. Congregate Care national average was calculated by aggregating national institution and group home totals reported in AFCARS Reports. Current average is from AFCARS Report # 28, Preliminary Estimate for Fiscal Year 2020, the most recent report available.

# Dependent Placement Services

Figure 24. Children in Dependent Placements on June 30, 2022, by Placement Type




- Most (88%) youth in placement on 6/30/22 were in kinship or foster care
- Fewer than 1 in 10 (7%) youth in placement on 6/30/22 were in congregate care

*As of 9/21/2022 there were 3,730 children and youth in dependent placement*

Data run on 8/3/2022.  
\*Pending youths' service information had yet to be entered into the electronic database as of the date the data were run  
Percentages for this figure have been rounded to the nearest whole number, so total will not equal 100%

# Dependent Placement Services

Figure 25. Children in Dependent Foster and Kinship Care on June 30, 2022



- More than half (58%) of youth in dependent family-based placements on June 30, 2022, were placed with kin

N=3,455


Data run on 8/3/2022  
Family based placements include kinship care, foster care, and emergency foster care.

## Family Foster Care Sibling Composition

Table 1. Sibling Composition of Youth in Foster Care and Kinship Care on June 30, 2022, by CUA

CUA	Total Number of Sibling Groups	Percentage of Intact Sibling Groups
01 - NET	79	57%
02 - APM	92	62%
03 - TPFC	79	54%
04 - CCS	56	63%
05 - TPFC	136	54%
06 - TABOR	74	54%
07 - NET	57	58%
08 - BETH	61	62%
09 - TPFC	87	54%
10 - TPFC	78	46%
Overall	799	56%


Figure 26. Sibling Composition of Youth in Foster Care and Kinship Care on June 30, 2022



- Of the 799 sibling groups placed in family foster care, 56% were placed together
- CUA 4 had the highest percentage of intact sibling groups (63%) and CUA 10 had the lowest percentage (46%)

# Dependent Placement Services

Figure 27. Children in Dependent Congregate Care on June 30, 2022




N=252

- Half (50%) of all youth in dependent congregate care were in group homes on 6/30/22
- Just over 1 in 4 (26%) youth were in a non-Residential Treatment Facility (non-RTF) institution
- Nearly 1 in 10 youth (8%) were in a Community Behavioral Health-funded RTF



# Dependent Placement Services

Figure 28. Dependent Congregate Care Totals on June 30, 2022




- Since June 30, 2018, the number of dependent youth in congregate care settings decreased 61% from 654 youth to 252 youth
- Aligned with the goal of reducing the use of congregate care, this decrease outpaces the overall decrease in youth in dependent placements (36%) during the same time period

*As of 9/21/2022 there were 286 youth in dependent congregate care placement*

Data run on 8/3/2022

# Family Foster Care Distance From Home

Figure 29. Distance from Home for Youth in Kinship and Foster Care as of June 30, 2022



N=3,455

- A majority (54%) of youth in kinship and foster care lived within 5 miles of their home of origin, and 81% lived within 10 miles

Data run on 8/3/2022

"Unable to Determine Distance" included houses located outside of Philadelphia or incomplete addresses that could not be geocoded. Distances were calculated using ArcMap 10.6 GIS Software. 34

## Dependent Congregate Care Distance from Home

*Table 2. Distance between Congregate Care Facilities and City Limits as of June 30, 2022*

Distance	# of Facilities	# of Youth
In Philadelphia	15	94
Within 5 Miles	7	94
6 - 10 Miles	6	26
11 - 25 Miles	4	9
26 - 50 Miles	7	13
Over 50 Miles	8	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>252</b>

- 60% of congregate care facilities (serving 84% of youth) were either in Philadelphia or within 10 miles of the City limits

## Caseload


Table 3. Case Management Workers' Caseload Distribution on June 30, 2022

CUA	Total workers	Total cases	Median caseload	Average caseload
01 – NET	30	309	12	10
02 – APM	15	267	21	18
03 – TPFC	37	344	13	9
04 – CCS	25	276	12	11
05 – TPFC	29	504	20	17
06 – TABOR	27	286	13	11
07 – NET	30	291	10	10
08 – BETH	25	262	15	10
09 – TPFC	21	314	17	15
10 – TPFC	36	324	9	9
DHS	Total workers	Total cases	Median caseload	Average caseload
OSR	5	59	12	12
<b>Overall</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>3,236</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>

- The average caseload for both CUA and DHS Ongoing Service Region (OSR) was 12 cases per worker
- CUA 3 and CUA 10 had the lowest average caseload (9), and CUA 2 had the highest (18)

# Monthly Visitation


Figure 30. DHS and CUA Visitation Rates by Month



- DHS and CUA monthly visitation rates fluctuated during FY22

# Monthly Visitation

Figure 31. June 2022 Visitation Rates, by CUA



- In June 2022, five CUAs had visitation above 90%
  - Four CUAs had visitation in the 80-89% range
  - One CUA had a visitation of 70%



# Dependent Services Summary

- In FY22, CUAs closed more cases than they had referred to them every month except April 2022
- Both the number of families and children with in-home and placement services continued to decrease from previous fiscal years
- The total number of youth in dependent congregate care placements decreased
- While system level caseload size improved and overall visitation rates were stable in FY22, some CUAs are inconsistent and still experience high caseloads and low visitation rates

In summary, while some CUAs experienced challenges, as a system more children and youth are maintained in their own homes and communities, and we continue to safely reduce congregate care.

More information on why Hotline reports increased from FY21 to FY22 can be found on slides 79-85 of this document.




# Juvenile Justice Programs



### Intensive Prevention Services


*Intensive Prevention Services (IPS) serve youth between 10 and 19 years old at risk for becoming dependent or juvenile justice-involved due to high-risk behaviors.*

Figure 32. IPS Service **Referrals**



- 832 youth were referred to IPS in FY22, more than the previous two fiscal years

Figure 33. IPS **Voluntary Service Rate**




- Higher than previous years, 84% of youth offered IPS in FY22 voluntarily enrolled in services

## Evening Reporting Centers

*Evening Reporting Centers (ERCs) are community-based, afterschool programs that provide daily structured activities and serve as an alternative to placement for juvenile justice-involved youth ages 14-18.*

Figure 34. Youth Receiving Evening Reporting Center Services



- Evening Reporting Centers served 333 youth in FY22
- The number of youth served by ERCS increased 57% from 193 in FY21 to 333 in FY22

### Evening Reporting Center Types


- **The Pre-ERC:** for youth in the pre adjudicatory phase
- **The Community Intervention Center (CIC) ERC:** for youth during their court case
- **The Post-ERC:** for youth after their case has been adjudicated
- **Aftercare ERC (AERC):** for youth who have been discharged from JJ congregate care placement

Data run on 9/16/2022

# Juvenile Justice Involved Youth Demographics – June 30, 2022

*PJJSC, Delinquent Congregate Care & Community Placements*


Figure 35. Sex



N=324

- As of 6/30/22, 9 in 10 (90%) juvenile justice-involved youth were male


Figure 36. Age



N=324

- Nearly 3 in 4 (71%) juvenile justice-involved youth were between the ages of 16 and 18 years old

Figure 37. Race/Ethnicity



N=324

- Nearly 4 in 5 (81%) juvenile justice-involved youth were Black


Data run on 8/3/2022

\*Sample size discrepancy across sex, age, and race/ethnicity is the result of unreported race/ethnicity

# Juvenile Justice Involved Youth Placed Outside of Home

## *PJJSC, Delinquent Congregate Care & Community Placements*

Figure 38. Juvenile Justice Involved Youth Placed Outside of the Home on June 30, 2022, by Location



- On June 30, 2022, there were 291 juvenile justice-involved youth placed outside the home
- Roughly 2 in 5 (38%) youth were placed in congregate care, and 60% were detained at the Philadelphia Juvenile Justice Services Center (PJJSC)


*As of 9/21/2022 there were 199 youth in the PJJSC and 110 youth in delinquent congregate care placement*

Data run on 8/3/2022  
"Other community placements" include foster care and supervised independent living  
Data for Juvenile Justice-involved youth in placement alternatives, such as GPS monitoring, are not tracked directly by DHS  
Percentages in pie chart may not equal 100% because of rounding

# Juvenile Justice Placement Services

## PJJSC

Figure 39. PJJSC Placement Totals on June 30th



- Since June 30, 2022, the number of youth in the PJJSC has increased by 41% from 103 youth to 175 youth


*As of 9/21/2022 there were 199 youth in the PJJSC*

Data run on 8/3/2022

# Juvenile Justice Placement Services

## PJJSC Length of Stay

Figure 40. Median Length of Stay (Days) for Youth Exiting the PJJSC in Q4




- The median length of stay for youth who left the PJJSC during FY22 Q4 was 15 days
- The median length of stay for youth leaving the PJJSC increased 50% from 10 days in FY19 Q4 to 15 days in FY22 Q4

Data run on 8/3/2022  
Median length of stay (midpoint) is used to describe trends in length of stay over average length of stay, which can be affected by very long and short stayers. Youth who entered and exited the PJJSC on the same day were not counted.  
Youth who have been held at the PJJSC through Act 96 instead of adult prison while their case is ongoing may also be counted in this figure.  
This measure uses an exit cohort which may over represent those youth who leave the PJJSC quickly.

# Juvenile Justice Placement Services

## *Delinquent Congregate Care*

Figure 41. Children in Delinquent Congregate Care on June 30, 2022




N=110

- Over 4 in 5 (83%) youth placed in delinquent congregate care on June 30, 2022, were placed in a state institution
- Roughly 1 in 10 (11%) youth placed in delinquent congregate care were in a non-RTF, non-state institution

### Juvenile Justice Placement Services *Delinquent Congregate Care*

Figure 42. Delinquent Congregate Care Totals on June 30th



- Since June 30, 2018, the total number of delinquent youth in congregate care settings decreased 81% from 589 youth to 110 youth


*As of 9/21/2022 there were 110 youth in delinquent congregate care placement*



# Juvenile Justice Placement Services

## *Delinquent Congregate Care*

Figure 43. Median Length of Stay (Days) for Delinquent Youth Leaving Congregate Care in Q4



- The median length of stay for youth who left delinquent congregate care settings in FY22 Q4 was 163 days
- The median length of stay for youth leaving delinquent congregate care settings has decreased by 27% from 222 days in FY19 Q4 to 163 days in FY22 Q4

Data run on 8/3/2022

Median length of stay (midpoint) is used to describe trends in length of stay over average length of stay, which can be affected by very long and short stayers.

Congregate Care placements include Group Homes, CBH-Funded Residential Treatment Facilities (RTFs), Non-RTF Institutions, and State Institutions.

This measure uses an exit cohort which may over represent those youth who leave congregate care quickly.

### Delinquent Congregate Care Distance from Home

*Table 4. Distance between Congregate Care Facilities and City Limits as of June 30, 2022*

Distance	# of Facilities	# of Youth
In Philadelphia	1	5
Within 10 Miles	1	1
11 - 50 Miles	1	3
51 - 100 Miles	3	37
101 - 200 Miles	5	60
Over 200 Miles	3	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>110</b>

- Just 2 delinquent congregate care facilities (serving 5% of youth) were located within Philadelphia or 10 miles of City limits



# Juvenile Justice Services Summary

- In FY22, Intensive Prevention Services and Evening Reporting Centers, two juvenile justice prevention-diversion programs, served more youth than in previous fiscal years
- The number of juvenile justice-involved youth in congregate care continued to decrease
- The number of youth detained at the PJJSC increased
- Only two congregate care facilities, serving a small number of youth were located within or near Philadelphia

In summary, DHS served more children and youth in their own homes and communities through juvenile justice prevention-diversion programs and continued to reduce congregate care use. However, youth detained at PJJSC increased and most congregate care facilities for JJ-involved youth are far from Philadelphia.


More information on why Hotline reports increased from FY21 to FY22 can be found on slides 79-85 of this document.



# Permanency

## Permanency Rates and Totals


Figure 44. Permanency Totals by Permanency Type



- In FY22 1,219 children and youth attained permanency through reunification, adoption, and Permanent Legal Custodianship (PLC)
- Less than half (45%) of permanencies in FY22 were reunifications, a lower percentage than the previous fiscal year

## Adoptions and Permanent Legal Custody (PLC)


Figure 45. Youth Who were **Adopted** by Foster and Kinship Parents



N= 518

- Of the 518 children and youth who were adopted in FY22, 61% were adopted by their kinship parents

Figure 46. Youth Who were **Discharged to PLC** with Foster and Kinship Parents




N=149

- Of the 149 children and youth who were discharged to PLC, 77% were discharged to PLC with their kinship parents

## Children and Youth Waiting for Adoption

*Children waiting for adoption include those with a goal of adoption and/or children whose parents have had their parental rights terminated.*

Figure 47. Children and Youth Waiting for Adoption on June 30, 2022



- One in 4 (25%) youth in placement on June 30, 2022 were waiting for adoption
- This is slightly greater than the PA state average (22%), but less than the national average (29%)

Data run on 9/14/2022

This metric includes children who have a goal of adoption, and/or whose parental rights have been terminated. Youth 16 years old and older whose parents' parental rights have been terminated and who have a goal of emancipation have been excluded from the estimate.

Comparison data for the PA state and national averages was obtained from the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Kids Count Data Center which collects Children in foster care waiting for adoption in the United States" data from the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) 2020 #255. <https://datacenter.kidscount.org/>

# Permanency Timeliness – PBC Measures

- Since FY19, DHS has been evaluating system permanency using our Performance Based Contracting (PBC)
- Considered best practice, we are now only reporting the PBC measures
- **PBC measures are based on entry cohorts.** This means we track all youth who enter within the given fiscal year to determine how many achieve permanency within 12 and 36 months
- **Entry cohorts are considered best practice** when measuring the experiences of children in placement because of their accuracy and ability to track changes over time<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Wulczyn, F., Alpert, L., Orlebeke, B., & Haight, J. (2014). Principles, language, and shared meaning: Toward a common understanding of CQI in child welfare. *The Center for State Child Welfare Data, Chapin Hall: Chicago, IL, USA.*


<sup>2</sup>Courtney, M. E., Needell, B., & Wulczyn, F. (2004). Unintended consequences of the push for accountability: The case of national child welfare performance standards. *Children and Youth Services Review, 26*(12), 1141-1154.



## Permanency Timeliness –PBC Measures

Figure 48. Timeliness of Permanency – PBC T1


**T1**



- **T1** measures the percentage of youth who reached permanency within 12 months of entering placement
- Slightly over 1 in 6 youth (19%) who entered placement in FY21 reached permanency within 12 months– roughly equal to previous years, but lower than the benchmark of 30%

## Permanency Timeliness –PBC Measures


Figure 49. Timeliness of Permanency – PBC T2



- **T2** measures the percentage of youth that reached permanency within 36 months for youth in care for at least 12 continuous months
- Over 1 in 4 youth (28%) who entered placement during FY20 and remained in care for at least 12 months reached permanency within 36 months, slightly lower than the benchmark of 30%

### Permanency- Re-Entry

Figure 50. One-Year Re-Entry Rate



- Fewer than 1 in 10 (8.5%) youth who were reunified in FY21, re-entered dependent placement within one year
- The one-year re-entry rate has decreased every year since FY18
- The FY21 re-entry rate was lower than the PA state rate (13.6%), but slightly higher than the national median (7.4%)

Data run on 8/16/2022

Pennsylvania state and National median re-entry rates were obtained from the Children's Bureau's most recent public Child Welfare Outcomes Report Data. The most current publicly available National and PA state figures are from 2019 and are located here: <https://cwoutcomes.acf.hhs.gov/cwodatasite/fourTwo/index>



# Permanency Summary

- In FY22, children attaining permanency through reunification, adoption, and permanent legal custodianship decreased
- The percentage of permanencies through reunification decreased from the previous year
- Permanency timeliness remained stable from the previous two fiscal years
- Re-entry of children to foster care following reunification continued to decrease

In summary, permanency timeliness was stable and fewer children re-entered foster care. However, fewer children overall attained permanency and a lower percentage of those permanencies were reunifications, as compared to previous years. This is likely related to fewer families with children in placement and more families with complex needs.

More information on why Hotline reports increased from FY21 to FY22 can be found on slides 79-85 of this document.



# Spotlight Section: Child Care Room



Office of  
**Children and Families**  
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

---

Department of Human Services



# Agenda

- 1 Childcare Room Overview
- 2 Childcare Room Data
- 3 Childcare Room Reduction Strategies
- 4 Philadelphia Juvenile Justice Center (PJJSC) Population and Reduction Strategies



# Childcare Room Overview

### What is the Childcare Room?



DHS uses the Childcare Room to provide short-term emergency care for children and youth in Philadelphia when placement is required due to a safety threat



A child or youth will come to the Childcare Room while DHS works to identify a placement



The Childcare Room is open 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, and is staffed with recreation specialists as well as DHS social workers



Most children and youth who stay in the Childcare Room have experienced a placement disruption, stay for only one night, and are then placed with one of our contracted providers





# Childcare Room Data

## Children that Stayed in the Childcare Room by Fiscal Year

*Table 2. Children that Stayed in the Childcare Room by Fiscal Year*

Fiscal Year	Unique Children Staying Overnight
FY18	95
FY19	60
FY20	106
FY21	118
FY22	301
<b>Total</b>	<b>680</b>

- From FY18 to FY22, **680** children and youth stayed overnight in the Childcare Room
- The number of children and youth who stayed overnight in the Childcare Room was **2.5 times greater in FY22 (n=301) than FY21 (118)**

## Children that Stayed in the Childcare Room by Age

Table 3. Children that Stayed in the Childcare Room by Age

Fiscal Year	Ages 0-5	Ages 6-10	Ages 11-17	Ages 18+
FY18	5	25	59	6
FY19	9	22	23	6
FY20	12	37	54	3
FY21	18	25	65	10
FY22	37	54	192	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>81 (12%)</b>	<b>163 (24%)</b>	<b>393 (58%)</b>	<b>43 (6%)</b>

- **58%** of all children and youth who stayed overnight from FY18-FY22 were between the ages of 11 and 17
- The percentage of youth ages 11 to 17 remained consistent throughout the 5-year time period

## Children that Stayed in the Childcare Room by Sex

Table 4. Children that Stayed in the Childcare Room by Sex

Fiscal Year	Female	Male
FY18	25 (26%)	70 (74%)
FY19	20 (33%)	40 (67%)
FY20	52 (49%)	54 (51%)
FY21	58 (49%)	60 (51%)
FY22	175 (58%)	126 (42%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>330 (49%)</b>	<b>350 (51%)</b>

- Over the past five years, the percentage of female children and youth staying in the Childcare Room has increased from **26%** in FY18 to **58%** in FY22

## Children that Stayed in the Childcare Room by Primary Race

Table 5. Children that Stayed in the Childcare Room by Race and Ethnicity

Fiscal Year	Black/African American	Latino	White	Other	Multiple	Unable to Determine
FY18	76	-	16	-	2	1
FY19	40	8	4	2	3	3
FY20	70	18	7	2	9	-
FY21	92	13	7	-	4	2
FY22	211	40	29	3	12	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>489 (72%)</b>	<b>79 (12%)</b>	<b>63 (9%)</b>	<b>7 (1%)</b>	<b>30 (4%)</b>	<b>12 (2%)</b>

- Black children and youth stayed in the Childcare Room at a higher rate compared to children and youth of other races, accounting for **72%** of youth between FY18 and FY22

## Overnight Stays by Previous Service

Table 6. Children that Stayed in the Childcare Room by Previous Service

Fiscal Year	Emergency Shelter	Foster Care	Foster Care Emergency	Group Home	In-Home Non-Safety	In-Home Safety	Kinship Care	No Service	Runaway In-Home	Runaway Placement
FY18	3	21	5	6	6	4	8	15	2	7
FY19	3	13	2	1	4	7	5	9	1	2
FY20	5	32	3	2	5	1	8	21	2	7
FY21	10	26	2	3	7	9	10	12	0	18
FY22	30	54	1	4	9	10	30	43	11	51
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b> <b>(9%)</b>	<b>146</b> <b>(27%)</b>	<b>13</b> <b>(2%)</b>	<b>16</b> <b>(3%)</b>	<b>31</b> <b>(6%)</b>	<b>31</b> <b>(6%)</b>	<b>61</b> <b>(11%)</b>	<b>100</b> <b>(18%)</b>	<b>16</b> <b>(3%)</b>	<b>85</b> <b>(15%)</b>

- **82%** of children and youth who came to the Childcare Room from FY18-FY22 were actively receiving DHS services
- **40%** of children and youth were in foster care, emergency foster care, or kinship care immediately prior to their stay in the Childcare Room

### Major Findings about Children who Stay in the Childcare Room

- Most youth enter the childcare room following a placement disruption
- The number of children and youth who stayed in the Childcare Room increased from FY18 (n=118) to FY22 (n=301)
- Across all fiscal years, most children and youth who used the Childcare Room were Black (72%) and between the ages of 11-17 (58%)
- The percentage of female children and youth has increased from FY18 (26%) to FY22 (58%)
- Most children and youth who entered the childcare room in FY22 had only one entry (71%)



# Childcare Room Reduction Strategies



# Strategies to Reduce Utilization of the Childcare Room

To address the rising use of the Childcare Room, DHS plans to:



1. Continue working with Community Behavioral Health (CBH) to connect youth to immediate behavioral health supports to stabilize them before a placement disruption occurs



2. Work with CUA and provider agencies to use kinship resources whenever possible- Released RFP for kinship care navigator program.



3. Increase emergency resource and kinship care homes for same day emergency placement.







4. Selected Foster Care Provider for professional resource parents to care for older youth and youth with behavioral health needs




5. Directly engage with youth who spend more than one night in the Childcare Room to develop a personalized plan

## Addressing Placement Disruptions

To address the high rate of placement disruptions for children and youth in placement, DHS plans to:

-  Use pre-placement interviews and visits to make optimal first placements for children and youth
-  Strengthen programs that support resource parents to better address the needs of children and youth through the development of the Resource Parent Social Work Support and Kinship Navigator Programming
-  Assess the timeliness and quality of Placement Stability Family Team Conferences
-  Find appropriate new placements for children and youth before placement disruptions occur



# Philadelphia Juvenile Justice Center (PJJSC)

## Current Population and Reduction Strategies

## Juvenile Justice Service Center (JJSC) Population Summary

Table 7. Juvenile Justice Service Center (JJSC) Population Summary

PJJSC Census	State Committed Youth Awaiting Transfer	Private Youth Awaiting Transfer	Act 96 Youth
209	84	0	30

- The median length of stay for youth who left the PJJSC in FY22 Q4 was 15 days

Data as of 9/29/22

Median length of stay (midpoint) is used to describe trends in length of stay over average length of stay, which can be affected by very long and short stayers. Youth who entered and exited the PJJSC on the same day were not counted.

Youth who have been held at the PJJSC through Act 96 instead of adult prison while their case is ongoing are counted in the PJJSC Census

### Strategies to Reduce youth awaiting placement at the PJJSC

To address the number of youth awaiting placement in the PJJSC, DHS plans to:



Continue services for Diversion alternatives to Detention through programs such as:

- Police School Diversion Program
- Summary Offense Diversion Program (including retail theft cases)
- Post-Petition Diversion through Youth Aid Panels offered by the District Attorney's Office
- The Juvenile Probation Department's use of Informal Adjustment



Work with the state to identify additional state secure beds



Engage current delinquent in-state providers to increase capacity for Philadelphia beds



Develop a Request For Proposals (RFP) for additional institutional delinquent providers



# Thank You!