



Commissioner's Monthly Report May 2020

Christine Beyer
Commissioner

The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly impacted all aspects of life and work in New Jersey. Statewide efforts to prevent and mitigate community spread have been all-encompassing. Through Executive Orders, Governor Phil Murphy directed all New Jersey residents to stay home, closing schools and non-essential businesses and cancelling all gatherings.¹ As more has become known about COVID-19's methods of transmission, a clearer picture has emerged about crucial precautionary measures, including social distancing, the use of personal protective equipment and cleaning regimens.

Like all other aspects of life in New Jersey, the child welfare system has been significantly impacted by the public health crisis. The extraordinary circumstances of the present emergency have required DCF's operations to be responsive and evolutionary. We have changed the way that we conduct our work while remaining dutiful to our critical mission of service to New Jersey's children and their families.

In the early weeks of the pandemic, DCF closed 46 local offices, restricted access to 9 area offices, and moved 16 regional schools and 2 DCF-operated, hospital-based satellite schools to remote learning. DCF's Office of Information and Technology converted the majority of our 6,700 staff members to remote work. DCF altered practices and policies that guide our daily interactions with children, families, our own staff and partner providers: DCF set up COVID-19 response teams to respond to child protective service investigations and complete home visits on select cases; requirements for in-person visits between parents and children, children and their siblings and caseworkers and families were temporarily suspended in favor of telephonic and video conferencing communication; timeframes for critical practices, such as case plans and family team meetings, were similarly temporarily suspended.² After the enactment of new legislation permitting telemedicine and telehealth services, DCF authorized the provision of many outpatient, in-home and community-based services via remote technology.³ DCF learned to operate in a court system that was transitioning from in-person hearings to virtual proceedings.⁴

The data contained in this report shows marked shifts in measures of performance in certain areas of casework, most notably measurements related to in-person visitation and family team meetings. When reviewing this data, it is important to recognize: **while the operating rules and expectations have undergone swift and significant changes, the metrics included in this report have not yet been altered to measure the new, revised practice expectations.** In other words, DCF is sharing "post-COVID-19" data using "pre-COVID-19" performance metrics. For some measures, the underlying processes have been temporarily suspended, i.e., in-person visitation between caseworkers, parents, and children. While the data shows the declines in in-person visits, it may not account for supplemental virtual visits via video conferencing or for phone communications, which DCF's electronic case management system is being updated to capture. For other measures, the rapid conversion to remote work resulted in data entry issues related to connectivity. While this has improved with time, documentation for completed work is still being entered in DCF's case management system. Additionally, we know that not all families possess the technology required to participate in remote visits, teleconferences, and electronic hearings. As DCF and the Administrative Office of the Courts provide greater access to families, their ability to participate in these types of activities will increase.

As the needs of children and families in New Jersey change in light of the health and economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, DCF's operations, practice standards, policies, and resources will continue to evolve responsively and reflectively. DCF will not, however, change our commitment to continued monitoring of performance and transparent dissemination of data to the public.

¹ N.J. Exec. Order No. 104 (March 16, 2020), https://nj.gov/infobank/eo/056murphy/approved/eo_archive.html, N.J. Exec. Order No. 107 (March 21, 2020), https://nj.gov/infobank/eo/056murphy/approved/eo_archive.html.

² DCF Admin. Order No. 13 (March 22, 2020, Revised April 22, 2020) https://www.nj.gov/dcf/policy_manuals/AO-I-A-1-013_issuance.shtml

³ A3860 Assemb. Reg. Sess. 2020-2021 (NJ 2020). (Approved March 19, 2020 at P.L. 2020, c.3.)

⁴ N.J. Supreme Court Omnibus Order (March 27, 2020) <https://njcourts.gov/public/covid19.html>

Monthly Report

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
SUSTAINABILITY AND EXIT PLAN SUMMARY	3
SUSTAINABILITY AND EXIT PLAN - KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	4
DCF AT A GLANCE - DASHBOARD	5
SECTION I: CHILD PROTECTION & PERMANENCY	6-8
SECTION II: ADOLESCENT SERVICES	9
SECTION III: INSTITUTIONAL ABUSE INVESTIGATION UNIT	9
SECTION IV: CHILDREN'S SYSTEM OF CARE	10
SECTION V: FAMILY & COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS	11
SECTION VI: DIVISION ON WOMEN	11-12
ADDENDUM 1: KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS BY CPP LOCAL OFFICE	13
ADDENDUM 2: CASELOAD COMPLIANCE	14

TO BE MAINTAINED Successfully Maintained				
	Measure Description	Target	Performance	
Caseloads	Intake Workers Caseload (Local Offices)	95%	100%	✓
	Intake Workers Caseload	90%	95%	✓
	Permanency Workers Caseload (Local Offices)	95%	100%	✓
	Permanency Workers Caseload	95%	100%	✓
	Adoption Workers Caseload (Local Offices)	95%	99%	✓
	Adoption Workers Caseload	95%	98%	✓
	Supervisor/Worker Ratio	95%	100%	✓
	IAIU Investigators Caseload	95%	100%	✓
	Adequacy of DASG Staffing	100%	99%	✓
	Child Health Units	Met	Met	✓
Process Measures	Timeliness of Investigation Completion (60 days)	85%	83%	✓
	Timeliness of Investigation Completion (90 days)	95%	95%	✓
	IAIU Timeliness of Investigation Completion (60 days)	80%	82%	✓
	Initial Family Team Meetings	80%	95%	✓
	Subsequent FTMs within 12 months	80%	84%	✓
	Subsequent FTMs after 12 months Reunification Goal	90%	95%	✓
	Subsequent FTMs after 12 months Other than Reunification Goal	90%	89%	✓
	Initial Case Plans- for Children Entering Placement	95%	94%	✓
	Timeliness of Current Plans	95%	96%	✓
	Caseworker Contacts with Children – New Placement/Placement Change	93%	94%	✓
	Child Visits with Siblings	85%	88%	✓

TO BE MAINTAINED CONT. Successfully Maintained				
	Measure Description	Target	Performance	
Process Measures	Caseworker Contact with Children in Placement	93%	94%	✓
	Parent-Child Visits –weekly	60%	77%	✓
	Parent-Child Visits – biweekly	85%	91%	✓
	Independent Living Assessments	90%	86%	✓
Quality Measures Annually	Educational Needs	80%	83%	✓
	Quality of Case Planning and Services	75%	70%	✓
	Housing (July - December 2018)	95%	96%	✓
	Employment/Education (July - Dec 2019)	85%	89%	✓
Outcome Measures Annually	Quality Investigations (March 2018)	85%	91%	✓
	Placing Siblings groups of 2 & 3 (CY 2018)	80%	77%	✓
	Placing Siblings groups of 4 or More (CY 2018)	80%	86%	✓
	Recruitment for Sibling Homes Serving Four or More (CY 2018)	Met	Met	✓
	Placement Stability- First 12 Months in Care (CY 2017)	84%	85%	✓
	Placement Stability- Children in Care 13 –24 Months (CY 2016)	88%	95%	✓
	Abuse and Neglect of Children in Foster Care (CY 2018)	0.49%	0.27%	✓
	Repeat Maltreatment In-home (CY 2017)	7.2%	5.0%	✓
	Maltreatment Post-Reunification (CY 2015)	6.9%	5.9%	✓
	Permanency within 12 Months (CY 2017)	42%	41%	✓
	Permanency within 36 Months (CY 2015)	80%	81%	✓
	Permanency within 48 Months (CY 2014)	86%	89%	✓
	Needs Assessment (July - Dec 2018)	Met	Met	✓

FOUNDATIONAL ELEMENTS				
	Measure Description	Target	Performance	
	Data Transparency successfully maintained			✓
	Case Practice Model successfully maintained			✓
	State Central Registry successfully maintained			✓
	Appropriate Placements successfully maintained			✓
	Service Array successfully maintained			✓
	Medical/Behavioral Health Services successfully maintained			✓
	Training successfully maintained			✓
	Flexible Funding successfully maintained			✓
	Resource Family Care Support Rates successfully maintained			✓
	Permanency successfully maintained			✓
	Adoption Practice successfully maintained			✓

TO BE ACHIEVED				
	Measure Description	Target	Performance	
Process Measures Monthly	Caseworker Contacts with Family When Goal is Reunification	90%	76%	□
	Quality of Teaming (CY 2018)	75%	58%	□
Quality Measures Annually	Quality of Case Plans (CY 2018)	80%	51%	□
	Services to Support Transitions (CY 2018)	80%	62%	□
Outcome Measures Annually	Re-entry to Placement (CY 2016)	9%	12.2%	□
	Permanency within 24 Months (CY 2016)	66%	65%	□

SUSTAINABILITY AND EXIT PLAN
Key Performance Indicators
On or About March 31st, 2020

"To Be Achieved" Measures					
	Month	¹ Performance	Exit Plan Target	% to Meet Target	
CW Visits with Parent 2x/Month	March '20	34%	90%	-56%	
"To Be Maintained" Measures					
	Month	Performance	Exit Plan Target	% to Meet Target	
Initial FTMs within 45 days	February '20	54%	80%	-26%	
Subsequent FTMs within 12 Months	March '20	67%	80%	-13%	
Subsequent FTMs after 12 Months - Reunification Goal (n=31)	March '20	68%	90%	-22%	
Subsequent FTMs after 12 Months - Other than Reunification Goal	March '20	90%	90%	0%	
Investigation Timeliness CP&P 60 Days	January '20	84%	85%	-1%	
Investigation Timeliness CP&P 90 Days	January '20	96%	95%	0%	
Investigation Timeliness IAIU	March '20	84%	80%	0%	
Initial Case Plans	March '20	92%	95%	-3%	
Ongoing Case Plans	March '20	97%	95%	0%	
Child Visit with Siblings	March '20	60%	85%	-25%	
Parent-Child Weekly Visit ²	March '20	39%	60%	-21%	
Parent-Child Visits Biweekly	March '20	56%	85%	-29%	
CW Visits Child Monthly (at placement site) ³	March '20	71%	93%	-22%	
CW Visits Child 2x/Month for first 2 Months in Placement	January '20	76%	93%	-17%	
Ind. Living Assessments 14-18 Years Old	March '20	90%	90%	0%	
Supervisor Worker Ratio	March '20	100%	95%	0%	
Caseloads: IAIU Investigators	March '20	100%	95%	0%	
Caseloads: Intake	March '20	95%	90%	0%	
Caseloads: Permanency	March '20	100%	95%	0%	
Caseloads: Adoption	March '20	98%	95%	0%	
 The blue bar indicates DCF performance in the current month.  The red bar indicates the difference between the current performance and the Exit Plan target.					

¹ Reported performance understates actual performance in some measures because data does not exclude all instances where an event could not occur.

² Compliance for Parent-Child Weekly Visits is measured by percent of children with weekly visits averaged over the number of weeks in the month.

³ Caseworker visits with Children in Placement (all locations) March 2020: 74 %.



DCF At A Glance Dashboard

On or About March 31st, 2020

DCF At a Glance		CSOC ⁵ Quick Facts	
DCF: Total Children Served in the Month ¹	78,446	Youth Open with CSOC ² (unduplicated count)	39,060
CP&P: Children/Youth Served	39,386	DD Eligible Children (unduplicated count)	14,049
Children Under 18	37,573	MRSS: Dispatches in the month	1,553
OOH Setting (< 18)	4,141	MRSS: Interventions (includes prior dispatches)	2,350
In-Home Setting (< 18)	33,432	Remained in same Living situation	98%
Youth 18-21	1,813		
OOH Setting (>18)	287	Care Management: Children Served	15,354
In-Home Setting (>18)	1,526	OOH Behavioral Health Settings: Children Served	904
FCP: Total Clients Served ³ (November)	16,397	Placed out of State	0
DOW: Total Clients Served (November) Excludes DH and RPE	1,830		
DCF: Families Served in the Month ⁴	25,536	PerformCare Calls	9,205
CP&P	19,746	DD Related Calls	1,437
FCP (Family Success Centers & Home Visiting) (April 2019)	5,790		

Hotline Referrals	12,398	FSCs: Families Served ⁹ (November)	2,199
CPS Reports	34%	Home Visiting: Families Served ⁹ (November)	3,591
CWS Referrals	9%	SBYSP: Clients Served (November)	10,607
Number of Human Trafficking Referrals ⁷	12		
Response Timeliness	95%	DV Services: Clients Served (November)	1,145
Monthly Staff Contacts/Children OOH	68%	Residential	17%
Entries to Care	149	Non-Residential	83%
Shelter Placements (December 2019)		SAARC: Clients Served (November)	685
Children under 13 placed in shelters	0	Displaced Homemaker: Clients Served (April)	673
Youth > 13 in shelters less than 30 days ⁸	96%	New Clients	18%
Subsidized Adoptions/KLG (Includes Subsidized Adoptions and subsidized KLGs)	15,650	Rape Prevention Clients Served (April)	5,625

¹ Some children may be served by both CP&P and CSOC and are over-represented in the final count of children served in the month.

² The definition for "Youth Open with CSOC" reflects youth who are involved and eligible to receive services through CSOC.

³ FCP measures clients served in SBYSP and DV Services. Since Family Success Centers and Home Visitation programs report data in terms of families served, each family is assumed to have at least one client.

⁴ Families served by DCF includes CP&P families and FCP families. FCP families served data has a one month lag.

⁵ CSOC Children may receive multiple services and are counted multiple times.

⁶ FCP quick facts are based on new families for FSCs, but both new and ongoing clients for Home Visiting and SBYSP. DoW quick facts are based on new clients for DV Services, but both new and ongoing clients served for SAARC, Displaced Homemakers and Rape Prevention Education.

⁷ The cumulative number of human trafficking referrals between **November 2013 and March 2020 was 977**. This figure could change depending on when the data is extracted.

⁸ Appropriate use of shelters include 1) alternative to detention 2) short term placement of an adolescent in crisis not to extend beyond 30 days 3) a basic center for homeless youth.

OOH Behavioral Health Settings: Children Served - Excludes Youth in Detention Alternatives and Diagnostic Settings.


Effective June 2017, All DoW data is reported Monthly except for Residential DV shelters and Unmet Needs Data.

⁹ Due to system upgrades within DCF, FCP and DOW data will not be available beginning May 2019. DCF will resume reporting on these data after the new systems have been updated with these data.


Section I: Child Protection & Permanency

CP&P Quick Facts						
Data in this chart includes children up to age 20.99					Mar-20	Δ from Mar '19
Families Under CP&P Supervision					19,746	-19%
Children Under CP&P Supervision					39,386	-19%
Children Receiving CP&P In-Home Services					34,958	-19%
Children in CP&P Out-of-Home Placement					4,428	-19%
Resource Family (non-Kin)		50.5%	2,237			
Resource Family Kinship		40.2%	1,779			
Group and Residential		7.4%	329			
Independent Living		1.9%	83			
Children Legally Free for Adoption (Excludes TPR Appeals)					856	-17%
Finalized Adoptions to date (CY2020) - As of 3/31/2020					129	-34%
Children in Subsidized Kinship Legal Guardianship					1,601	-1%
Children in Subsidized Adoptions					14,049	-1%
Entries to Care					149	-37%
Exits from Care					198	-36%

Children in Out-of-Home Placement:
Annual Entries, Exits and Monthly Point in Time Children in Placement




Total SCR Intakes
n = 12,398




- CPS Reports
- CWS Referrals
- Non CPS/CWS Child Related Calls

CPS & CWS Referrals




CWS Referrals Assigned to Local Offices




Section I: Child Protection & Permanency

**Caseload Compliance
(Individual Worker Level)**




Response and Investigation Timeliness




Referrals to Early Intervention


October 2019-March 2020
n = 464



Worker - Child Visits




Parent - Child Visits




Section I: Child Protection & Permanency


Worker- Parent Visits & Sibling Visits




Initial & Subsequent Family Team Meetings




Initial & Ongoing Case Plans



Medical Assessments for Children in Out of Home Placement (OOHP)




Immunizations for Children in OOHP



Children in OOHP with Annual Dental Exams

January - June 2018
n=3,637



Section II: Adolescent Services


OAS Quick Facts (March 2020)
Youth 18-21

Youth 18-21 years old served by CP&P⁴	1,813
Youth served "In Home" living with a parent/relative or living independently⁵	1,526
Youth served "Out-of-Home"	
Resource Family (non-Kin) (41.5%) 119	287
Resource Family Kinship (10.8%) 31	
Congregate Care Setting (23.7%) 68	
Independent Living (24.0%) 69	
Youth Receiving Adoption or KLG Subsidy	1,015

⁴ The data includes all 18-21 year olds who are active participants in an open CP&P case as of the end of the month.


⁵ The terms "out-of-home" and "in-home" may not be appropriate for all 18-21 year olds. Youth identified as "in-home" can either be residing with a parent/relative, or living independently. Any of these youth may be receiving services. These definitions are currently being reviewed to better understand how we capture DCF's work with this population. The goal of this ongoing work is to create three meaningful categories for 18-21 year olds 1) Youth in a formal out-of-home placement setting, 2) Youth that achieved permanency, and 3) Youth that never achieved permanency.

**Completed Independent Living Assessments
of Youth Ages 14-18 years**




Section III: Institutional Abuse Investigation Unit

IAIU Child Protective Service Reports




IAIU Investigation Timeliness




**IAIU Caseload Report
Statewide**

No more than 8 new investigations and 12 cases/month




**IAIU Caseload Report by Region
March 2020**



Section IV: Children's System of Care

Children in Care Management


April 2020



Rate of Children in Care Management by Count


April 2020

n=15,354



Children in Out of Home Treatment Settings


March 2020




Children in Out-of-Home Treatment Settings

March 2020


n=904



**Mobile Response Stabilization Services (MRSS)
Dispatched**




PerformCare Total Calls




Section V: Family & Community Partnerships

Family Success Centers - Families Served




School-Based Youth Services Programs -
New and Ongoing Clients Served




Section VI: Division on Women


Sexual Assault, Abuse and Rape Care Programs (SAARC)



Individuals Served by Rape Prevention and Education Programs (RPE)




Displaced Homemaker Program




Section VI: Division on Women


**Residential Domestic Violence Programs:
Victims' Average Length of Stay (days)**




**Domestic Violence Services - Adults and Children
Admitted to Residential and Non-Residential Services
Total New Clients**



Top 5 Counties with Residential DV Shelters Over Capacity
Women and Children Not Admitted to Domestic Violence Shelters Due to Insufficient Space



Top 5 Counties with Unmet Need for Non-Residential DV Services
Domestic Violence Victims Waiting for Non-Residential Services



Non-admitted clients are offered referrals to other counties.
Graph represents the 5 counties with most clients not admitted during the entire time period (sum of four quarters).
* Effective June 2017, All DoW data is reported Monthly except for Residential DV shelters and Unmet Needs Data.

Graph represents the 5 counties with most DV victims waiting for services during the entire time period (sum of four quarters).

CP&P Key Performance Indicators by Local Office - 6 Months View

	Target				Within 10% of Meeting Target				< 60% of Final Target					
Local Office	Measure 6	Measure 9	Measure 10	Measure 13	Measure 14	Measure 16	Measure 17	Measure 18	Measure 19	Measure 22	Measure 28	Measure 29	Measure 30	Measure 31
Atlantic East	98%	93%	92%	91%	93%	92%	84%	67%	100%	98%	60%	40%	66%	77%
Atlantic West	96%	97%	95%	95%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	73%	59%	74%	73%
Bergen Central	100%	86%	98%	98%	99%	100%	100%		100%	100%	67%	36%	64%	67%
Bergen South	100%	100%	95%	97%	99%	94%	95%	100%	100%	100%	85%	60%	84%	72%
Burlington East	97%	95%	95%	87%	96%	81%	86%	50%	100%	100%	76%	39%	62%	71%
Burlington West	98%	81%	90%	70%	92%	79%	80%	50%	81%	100%	71%	50%	69%	79%
Camden Central	86%	92%	89%	85%	95%	98%	77%	33%	100%	76%	68%	48%	71%	78%
Camden East	98%	95%	95%	73%	92%	94%	91%	100%	90%	96%	60%	47%	72%	74%
Camden North	88%	87%	91%	66%	87%	82%	48%	50%	94%	91%	59%	48%	72%	81%
Camden South	92%	91%	91%	72%	94%	76%	73%	100%	60%	100%	66%	41%	71%	58%
Cape May	98%	100%	90%	87%	95%	72%	81%	100%	100%	84%	73%	51%	78%	87%
Cumberland East	95%	88%	94%	65%	92%	76%	67%	100%	100%	85%	62%	41%	62%	73%
Cumberland West	99%	100%	93%	64%	93%	85%	96%	100%	100%	100%	71%	36%	61%	74%
Essex Central	81%	92%	91%	81%	95%	47%	81%	40%	60%	81%	64%	51%	73%	79%
Essex North	89%	91%	96%	90%	99%	50%	50%	0%	50%	100%	44%	64%	73%	68%
Essex South	98%	86%	89%	88%	96%	75%	67%		67%	100%	46%	39%	58%	76%
Gloucester East	98%	98%	92%	72%	90%	78%	82%	50%	46%	100%	62%	52%	78%	81%
Gloucester West	98%	90%	89%	85%	95%	86%	95%	50%	92%	93%	55%	51%	75%	76%
Hudson Central	100%	82%	95%	62%	82%	65%	72%	33%	92%	80%	66%	42%	63%	70%
Hudson North	100%	100%	93%	96%	98%	67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%	48%	75%	92%
Hudson South	100%	88%	94%	89%	94%	67%	92%		100%	89%	68%	55%	73%	89%
Hudson West	100%	100%	95%	95%	99%	100%	89%		75%	100%	82%	50%	79%	75%
Hunterdon	100%	100%	86%	95%	99%	25%	33%			100%	68%	33%	37%	42%
Mercer North	90%	71%	83%	77%	94%	71%	61%	33%	90%	97%	50%	33%	54%	74%
Mercer South	92%	62%	81%	82%	95%	84%	100%	57%	97%	93%	43%	43%	68%	60%
Middlesex Central	92%	86%	93%	72%	91%	60%	0%		100%	64%	57%	48%	80%	80%
Middlesex Coastal	91%	79%	92%	91%	96%	59%	60%	100%	100%	92%	52%	31%	54%	65%
Middlesex West	86%	68%	80%	81%	94%	64%	63%	50%	38%	75%	49%	48%	69%	71%
Monmouth North	100%	86%	98%	95%	99%	89%	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%	47%	78%	86%
Monmouth South	100%	100%	98%	95%	98%	73%	100%		100%	100%	87%	75%	82%	85%
Morris East	88%	67%	98%	93%	98%	80%	100%		100%	100%	83%	74%	91%	100%
Morris West	94%	63%	95%	78%	92%	93%	83%		100%	100%	58%	50%	86%	78%
Newark Center City	99%	96%	93%	81%	95%	97%	100%	100%	98%	100%	59%	47%	65%	82%
Newark Northeast	88%	97%	89%	94%	98%	88%	96%	92%	94%	100%	63%	39%	62%	84%
Newark South	98%	90%	92%	91%	97%	91%	89%	95%	100%	97%	45%	35%	61%	71%
Ocean North	97%	95%	96%	93%	98%	81%	95%		100%	94%	72%	52%	67%	69%
Ocean South	95%	96%	94%	91%	98%	90%	97%	100%	97%	100%	67%	48%	70%	70%
Passaic Central	91%	94%	96%	89%	96%	93%	88%	100%	100%	80%	74%	54%	79%	83%
Passaic North	95%	86%	92%	85%	94%	58%	57%	0%	100%	100%	63%	47%	71%	73%
Salem	100%	93%	96%	68%	91%	83%	95%	100%	100%	85%	75%	52%	70%	75%
Somerset	100%	67%	95%	89%	98%	67%	91%		100%	100%	64%	37%	67%	100%
Sussex	96%	100%	96%	88%	96%	69%	100%		100%	81%	82%	58%	89%	90%
Union Central	100%	82%	81%	79%	95%	79%	75%	100%	84%	90%	51%	32%	62%	80%
Union East	93%	100%	85%	85%	95%	31%	71%	0%	33%	100%	52%	43%	60%	67%
Union West	97%	79%	94%	78%	91%	53%	40%		100%	92%	48%	25%	41%	51%
Warren	93%	88%	81%	80%	90%	30%	67%	50%	73%	100%	66%	39%	66%	76%
Statewide	96%	89%	91%	84%	95%	79%	82%	73%	90%	92%	63%	45%	68%	75%

Blank cells mean that the office did not have any children eligible for that measure during that period.

Measure #	Description of the Measure	Final Target	Time Period Analyzed
M# 6	Ongoing Case Plans	95%	October'19-March '20
M# 9	Caseworker Visits with Children 2x/Month in 1st& 2nd Months of placement	93%	August '19-January '20
M# 10	Monthly Caseworker Visits with Children at child's placement site	93%	October'19-March '20
M# 13	Investigation Completion within 60 days	85%	August '19-January '20
M# 14	Investigation Completion within 90 days	95%	August '19-January '20
M# 16	Initial Family Team Meeting (FTMs) within 45 days of Child Removal	80%	September'19-February '20
M# 17	3 Subsequent FTMs within 12 Months of Child Removal	80%	October'19-March '20
M# 18	3 Subsequent FTMs after 12 Months in Placement - Reunification Goal	90%	October'19-March '20
M# 19	2 Subsequent FTMs after 12 Months in Placement - Non - Reunification Goal	90%	October'19-March '20
M# 22	Initial Case Plans within 30 Days of Child Removal	95%	October'19-March '20
M# 28	Caseworker visits Parent 2x/Month	90%	October'19-March '20
M# 29	Weekly Parent/Child Visits - Average weekly visits for 6 weeks.	60%	02/22/2020-03/28/2020
M# 30	Bi-weekly Parent-Child Visits	85%	October'19-March '20
M#31	Sibling Visits	85%	October'19-March '20

Worker and Office Caseads by Worker Type and by Local Office -March 2020

Met Target

< 70% of workers in compliance

Local Office	¹ Intake		² Permanency		³ Adoption	
	Worker Compliance	Office Compliant? Yes/No	Worker Compliance	Office Compliant? Yes/No	Worker Compliance	Office Compliant? Yes/No
Atlantic East	75%	No	97%	Yes	80%	No
Atlantic West	90%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Bergen Central	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Bergen South	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Burlington East	84%	No	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Burlington West	97%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Camden Central	87%	No	100%	Yes	67%	No
Camden East	96%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Camden North	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Camden South	76%	No	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Cape May	93%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Cumberland East	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Cumberland West	96%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Essex Central	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Essex North	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Essex South	94%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Guicester East	84%	No	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Guicester West	79%	No	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Hudson Central	93%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Hudson North	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Hudson South	94%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Hudson West	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Hunterdon	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Mercer North	95%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Mercer South	96%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Middlesex Central	87%	No	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Middlesex Coastal	93%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Middlesex West	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Monmouth North	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Monmouth South	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Morris East	93%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Morris West	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Newark Center City	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Newark Northeast	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Newark South	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Ocean North	97%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Ocean South	97%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Passaic Central	97%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Passaic North	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Salem	75%	No	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Somerset	96%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Sussex	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Union Central	100%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Union East	91%	Yes	100%	Yes	75%	No
Union West	95%	Yes	100%	Yes	50%	No
Warren	95%	Yes	100%	Yes	100%	Yes
Statewide⁴	95%	Yes	100%	Yes	98%	Yes

1 Intake

- Intake worker compliance: % of workers with no more than 8 new intakes in the month, no more than 12 Primary families and no more than a total of 14 families . Target=90%

- Office Compliance: % of offices that meet the casead standards of no more than 8 new intakes and 12 total families. Target = 95%

2 Permanency

- Permanency worker compliance: % of workers who meet the casead standards of no more than 15 families and 10 children in placement. Target = 95%

- Office Compliance: % of offices that meet the casead standards of no more than 15 families and 10 children in placement. Target = 95%

3 Adoption

- Adoption worker compliance: % of adoption workers who meet the casead standards of 15 or fewer children. Target = 95%

- Office Compliance: % of offices that meet the casead standards of 15 or fewer children. Target = 95%

- Offices with blank data do not carry adoption caseads , however adoption cases in those offices are handled by other offices in that area.

4 Statewide

- Performance is based on total workers in compliance for the month, not an average. Percentages are rounded to the whole number.