

Key Strategies for Rightsizing Congregate Care being used Nationally - Attachment A

States	Key Strategies for Rightsizing Congregate Care
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invested existing resources into the most effective strategies through the Child Welfare Demonstration Project. • Four counties partnered with provider agencies to create a Residentially Based Services model and a new payment system linked to performance. • Combined short-term residential intervention with an extended period of intensive home and community based services being provided by the same team of professionals.
Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kinship Process Mapping helped to identify rules, regulations and practices that were barriers to placing children with family members. • Implemented modified versions of Team Decision Making to be used for cases involving emergency placement, prior to the proposed placement, and for children ages 12 and under already in congregate care to be moved to a more family-like setting. • Reviewed all children in out-of-state placements to determine whether the child could return to Connecticut or back home.
Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passed SB 940 that made numerous changes to statutes related to residential group home placements for the child welfare system. • Bill required the child welfare system to develop a continuum of care for children in out of home care that would address their placement and service needs. • Bill also required that placement of children of certain ages in residential group home settings use a shift-care model, be subject to certain restrictions and requires periodic review of those placements.
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changed front line practice to involve youth identifying possible placement resources. • Expanded community and family resources to support and ensure that the needs of children leaving congregate care would be met. • Strengthened their foster home development strategy to recruit more foster families, streamline licensure, and improve retention rates among family-based care providers.
Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placement of youth into congregate care requires extensive review by multiple child welfare professionals who must give authorization prior to placement. • Worked with providers to prepare for shift from congregate

Key Strategies for Rightsizing Congregate Care being used Nationally - Attachment A

	<p>care to community-based services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinvested dollars that were saved from group home placement into home based services while offering transition funds to group placement providers.
Maryland (Baltimore City)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implemented the Place Matters Initiative, which promotes safety, strengthening families, permanency and community based services. • Practice is now driven by data. • Shifted resources from the back-end to front-end of services.
Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved recruitment and retention efforts by providing training and support to enhance their use of Therapeutic Foster Care and specialized foster homes for teenagers. • Created Practice Model Standards pertaining to the use of congregate care. • Worked with providers to implement a Continuum model and performance based contracting.
New York (New York City)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminated the weakest group home providers by evaluating the quality of each congregate care provider based on placement stability and permanency outcomes of children in care. • Designed an innovative case review process to find family placements for youth. • Engaged youth in the planning process.
Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Created the Council on Reform to serve as a steering committee for improving statewide efforts on child welfare. • Provided information and technical assistance including a performance measurement system called, “Safe Measures” to easily monitor progress using existing data. • Implemented Team Decision Making for all children being considered for a step down from congregate care.

Sources:

“Back on Track: Transforming Virginia’s Child Welfare System” <http://www.aecf.org/resources/back-on-track/>

“Fixing a Broken System: Transforming Maine’s Child Welfare System” <http://www.aecf.org/resources/fixing-a-broken-system/>

“Implementing Group Care Reform in California: The RBS Case Study” [RBS California Case Study Final_March 2015.pdf](http://www.aecf.org/resources/rbs-california-case-study-final-march-2015.pdf)

“Place Matters – Nothing Matters More to a Child than Home” http://www.dhr.state.md.us/blog/?page_id=7864

“Rightsizing Congregate Care” <http://www.aecf.org/resources/rightsizing-congregate-care/>

“The Connecticut Turnaround” <http://www.aecf.org/resources/the-connecticut-turnaround/>

The Florida Senate Bill Analysis and Fiscal Implications
<http://www.flsenate.gov/Session/Bill/2015/0940/Analyses/2015s0940.pre.cf.PDF>

“What Works in Child Welfare Reform: Reducing Reliance on Congregate Care in Tennessee”
http://www.childrensrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/2011-07-25_what_works_reducing_reliance_on_congregate_care_in_tn_final-report.pdf