



Commissioner's Dashboard

May 2015

Allison Blake, Ph.D., L.S.W
Commissioner

May 22, 2015

The data contained in this dashboard is considered preliminary and as a result, these figures might be different than the final reported figures. The data is produced for continuous quality improvement across DCF.

On or About May 31, 2015

DCF At a Glance		CSOC ⁶ Quick Facts	
DCF: Total Children Served in the Month ¹	93,540	Youth Open with CSOC (<i>unduplicated count</i>)	41,723
CP&P: Children/Youth Served	51,817	DD Eligible Children (<i>unduplicated count</i>)	17,816
OOH Setting (< 18)	7,150	MRSS: Dispatches in the month	1,823
In-Home Setting (< 18)	42,548	MRSS: Interventions (<i>includes prior dispatches</i>)	1,902
Youth 18-21	2,119	Remained in same Living situation	98%
Youth Open with CSOC ²	41,723		
		Care Management: Children Served	11,497
FCP: Total Clients Served ³	16,645	OOH Behavioral Health Settings: Children Served	1,618
DOW: Total Clients Served ⁴ (Monthly Average)	885	Placed out of State	1
DCF: Families Served in the Month ⁵	28,367	PerformCare Calls	9,991
CP&P	25,701	DD Related Calls	2,352
FCP (Family Success Centers & Home Visiting)	2,666	Sandy Related Calls	549

CP&P Quick Facts		FCP & DoW Quick Facts ⁷	
Hotline Referrals	16,769	FSCs: Families Served (April)	2,446
CPS Reports	33%	Home Visiting: Families Served (April)	220
CWS Referrals	9%	SBYSP: Clients Served (April)	12,612
Number of Human Trafficking Referrals ⁸	24	DV Services: Clients Served (April)	1,367
Response Timeliness	98%	Residential	17%
Monthly Staff Contacts/Children OOH	94%	Non-Residential	83%
Entries to Care	391		
Caseload: Intake	83%	SAARC: Clients Served (Jan - Mar 2015)	1,277
Caseload: Permanency	98%	Displaced Homemaker: Clients Served (Jan - Mar 2015)	1,379
Caseload: Adoption	89%	New Clients	34%
Subsidized Adoptions/KLG		RPE: Doses/Activities provided at Implementation Sites	
(Includes Subsidized Adoptions and subsidized KLGs)	16,204	(Nov '13 - Jan '14)	83

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 DoW measures clients served in SAARC and Displaced Homemakers. RPE measures doses or activities provided and does not allow for an unduplicated count of clients served.

⁵ Families served by DCF includes CP&P families and FCP families. FCP families served data has a one month lag.

⁶ CSOC Children may receive multiple services and are counted multiple times.

⁷ FCP quick facts are based on new clients/families. DoW quick facts are based on new and ongoing clients/families served.

⁸ The cumulative number of human trafficking referrals between November 2013 and May 2015 was 189.

The data contained in this dashboard is considered preliminary and as a result, these figures might be different than the final reported figures.

The data is produced for continuous quality improvement across DCF.

MSA Updates					
Comparing June 2014 to May 2015					
	June 2014	May 2015	Δ from Jun 2014	MSA Target	
Initial FTMs (April 2015)	74%	79%	5%	90%	
Quarterly FTMs	79%	81%	2%	90%	
Initial Case Plans (April 2015)	92%	92%	0%	95%	
Ongoing Case Plans	98%	97%	-1%	95%	
CW visits Child Monthly (at placement site) ¹	93%	94%	1%	98%	
CW visits Child 2x/Mo 1st2Mo (March 2015)	92%	91%	-1%	95%	
CW visits Parent 2x/Mo	78%	70%	-8%	95%	
Parent Child Weekly Visits ²	68%	61%	-7%	60%	
Response Timeliness	98%	98%	0%	98%	
Investigation Timeliness CP&P (February 2015)	76%	79%	3%	98%	
Investigation Timeliness IAIU	85%	89%	4%	80%	
Ind. Living Assessments 14-18 yrs	90%	92%	2%	95%	
Caseloads: Intake	85%	83%	-2%	95%	
Caseloads: Permanency	96%	98%	2%	95%	
Caseloads: Adoption	83%	89%	6%	95%	
<i>This table compares performance in the most current month to the last month of the previously published monitoring report (June 2014)</i>					
 The blue bar indicates DCF performance in the current month. The red bar indicates the difference between the current performance and the MSA target. Measures with a 30 or 60 day lag are noted next to the description of the measure.					

¹Caseworker visits with Child in Placement (all locations) May: 97%


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

Table of Contents

SECTION I: CHILD PROTECTION & PERMANENCY	5
SECTION II: ADOLESCENT SERVICES	10
SECTION III: INSTITUTIONAL ABUSE INVESTIGATION UNIT	11
SECTION IV: CHILDREN'S SYSTEM OF CARE	12
SECTION V: FAMILY & COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS	15
SECTION VI: DIVISION ON WOMEN	16
SECTION VII: TRACKING DATA AFTER SUPERSTORM SANDY	18
SECTION VIII: KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS BY CPP LOCAL OFFICE	21

Section I: Child Protection & Permanency

CP&P Quick Facts		
<i>Data in this chart includes children up to age 20.99</i>	n for	Δ from
	5/2015	5/2014
Families Under CP&P Supervision	25,701	-1%
Children Under CP&P Supervision	51,817	0%
Children Receiving CP&P In-Home Services	44,246	0%
Children in CP&P Out-of-Home Placement		
Resource Family (non-Kin)	(53%)	
Resource Family Kinship	(39%)	
Group and Residential	(7%)	
Independent Living	(2%)	
	7,571	-3%
Children Legally Free for Adoption (Excludes TPR Appeals)	1,176	9%
Finalized Adoptions to date (CY 2015)	275	-7%
Children in Subsidized Kinship Legal Guardianship	2,032	-2%
Children in Subsidized Adoptions	14,172	1%
Entries to Care	391	-12%
Exits from Care	333	-12%




The data contained in this dashboard is considered preliminary and as a result, these figures might be different than the final reported figures. The data is produced for continuous quality improvement across DCF.

Section I: Child Protection & Permanency

State Central Registry Statistics


Total SCR Intakes Recorded in NJ SPIRIT	16,769
CPS Reports	32.5%
CWS Referrals	9.3%
Non CPS/CWS Child Related Calls	58.2%

CPS & CWS Referrals Assigned to All CP&P Offices






Axis begins at 3,000 to enhance separation of data.

CWS Referrals Assigned to All CP&P Offices



Axis begins at 500 to enhance separation of data.


Section I: Child Protection & Permanency



Section I: Child Protection & Permanency


Monthly Staff Contacts (MSA Target for Out of Home Children = 98%)								
	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Δ from MSA	6 Months Average
In Home	91%	90%	93%	93%	93%	92%	N/A	92%
Out of Home Visits at Plcmnt Site	93%	91%	93%	93%	93%	94%	-4%	93%

Monthly Staff Contacts: In Home (n=20,075), Out-of-Home (n=6,720).



Section I: Child Protection & Permanency


Initial & Quarterly Family Team Meetings



Initial FTMs: (n=358) Compliance excludes children who exited within 30 days of removal.

Quarterly FTMs: (n=1698) Compliance excludes children who exited.

Initial & Ongoing Case Plans




Initial Case Plans: (n=368) Compliance excludes children who exited. 6 months average for Initial Case Plans is 92%.

Ongoing Case Plans (n=1013) Compliance excludes children who exited in the last six months. 6 months average for Ongoing Case Plans is 97%.

Section II: Adolescent Services



OAS Quick Facts Youth 18-21	
Youth 18-21 years old served by CP&P ⁴	2,119
Youth served "In Home" living with a parent/relative or living independently ⁵	1,698
Youth served "Out-of-Home"	421
Family Based Setting (56%)	
Congregate Care Setting (24%)	
Independent Living (19%)	
Youth Receiving Adoption or KLG Subsidy	1,094




[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.

Section III: Institutional Abuse Investigation Unit



Axis begins at 70% to enhance separation of data.




Axis begins at 70% to enhance separation of data.

Section IV: Children's System of Care

Children in Care Management

January 2010 - June 2015




Axis begins at 6,000 to enhance separation of data.

The relative increase in children in care management is attributable in part to an expansion of populations served. This includes children with developmental disabilities and children in need of substance abuse treatment.

Children in Care Management by County

as of 6/1/2015


(n= 11,497)



Section IV: Children's System of Care


Mobile Response Stabilization Services (MRSS) Dispatched

January 2011 - May 2015



Children in Out of Home Treatment Settings - All Children

January 2010 - May 2015





Axis begins at 1,500 to enhance separation of data.
Data does not include DD only children.

Children in Out-of-Home Treatment Settings - CSOC	
Total	1,618
Treatment Home	24%
Residential Treatment Center	29%
Specialty Bed	22%
Group Home	9%
Psychiatric Comm. Residence	12%
Intensive Residential Treatment	4%
Detention Alternative	1%


Total includes 1 child placed out-of-state.

Section IV: Children's System of Care




Section V: Family & Community Partnerships

Family Success Centers - Families Served



Methodology for counting FSC clients changed beginning in July 2013 to only count registered participants.


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



DCF's Strategic Priorities for 2014-2016 include developing a data system for Family & Community Partnership and the Division on Women to ensure the timeliness, consistency and quality of data collected from providers.

Section VI: Division on Women

Sexual Assault, Abuse and Rape Care Programs (SAARC)



	Jan-Mar 2014	Apr-Jun 2014 ⁶	Jul-Sep 2014 ⁷	Oct-Dec 2014 ⁷	Jan-Mar 2015 ⁸
Total Number of SAARC Programs	21	21	21	21	21
New Victims Served	786	752	755	713	642
Ongoing Victims Served	554	408	284	345	388
New Significant Others Served	105	147	179	144	161
Ongoing Significant Others Served	63	68	58	81	86
Total SAARC Served	1,508	1,375	1,276	1,283	1,277
Hotline/Email Services Provided	3,386	3,133	2,902	3,120	3,008
Accompaniments	355	421	441	366	305
Volunteer Confidential Sexual Violence Advocates	464	548	390	511	355

Rape Prevention & Education Programs (RPE)⁹	Nov-Jan 2013	Feb-April 2013 ⁶	May-July 2013 ¹⁰	Aug-Oct 2013 ⁶	Nov-Jan 2014 ⁶
Number of Doses/Activities Provided at Implementation Sites	107	128	165	72	83
Number of Recruitment Presentations & One-Time Education Sessions	167	249	135	181	61

Displaced Homemaker Program	Jan-Mar 2014	Apr-Jun 2014	Jul-Sep 2014	Oct-Dec 2014	Jan-Mar 2014
Number of New Clients Served	523	502	481	448	464
Number of Ongoing Clients Served	316	293	1328	914	915
Total Number of Clients Served	839	795	1809	1362	1379

⁶ Missing information from 1 county.

⁷ Provider reports were updated for the April 2015 dashboard. DOW reporting requirements changed for this reporting period. The method of calculating ongoing victims/significant others and volunteers changed, resulting in an underestimate. This will be adjusted in a future reporting period.

⁸ Provider reports were updated for the May 2015 dashboard. The method of calculating ongoing victims/significant others and volunteers remains underestimated. This will be adjusted in a future reporting period.


⁹ RPE reporting requirements are under revision. Data for the February 2014 - present will be available at a later date.

¹⁰ Missing information from 2 counties.

DCF's Strategic Priorities for 2014-2016 include developing a data system for Family & Community Partnership and the Division on Women to ensure the timeliness, consistency and quality of data collected from providers.

Section VI: Division on Women



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



The Domestic Violence data is different from the August 2014 dashboard because of provider data entry changes.

Section VII: Tracking Data after SuperStorm Sandy


10 Most Impacted Counties



Section VII: Tracking Data after SuperStorm Sandy

County-Level Surveillance of Residential DV Shelters Over Capacity

Women and Children Not Admitted to Domestic Violence Shelters Due to Insufficient Space




Non-admitted clients are offered referrals to other counties.

Cape May, Cumberland, Hudson & Ocean are not included. They had 5 or fewer clients not admitted during the entire time period.

Surveillance of Counties with Unmet Needs for Non-Residential DV Services

Domestic Violence Victims Waiting for Non-Residential Services




Bergen county includes two agencies, but all waiting victims come from one. The waiting list for this agency is group counseling, and the victim is likely to have received crisis counseling. Cape May, Essex, Monmouth & Ocean are not included. They had 10 or fewer DV victims waiting for services during the entire time period.

Section VII: Tracking Data after SuperStorm Sandy

Domestic Violence Services: Adults and Children Admitted to Residential and Non Residential Services


In Counties Impacted by SuperStorm Sandy



The Domestic Violence data is different from the August 2014 dashboard because of provider data entry changes.

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

In Counties Impacted by SuperStorm Sandy



Key Performance Indicators by CPP Local Office

June '14 - May '15

(Unless otherwise indicated in the footnote table)

	Met Target	Within 10% of Meeting Target						< 60% of Final Target				
Local Office	M# 3b	M# 4	M# 7a	M# 7b	M# 10	M# 11	M# 16	M# 17	M# 18	M# 20a¹	M#20b	Intake Caseload
Atlantic East	97%	64%	93%	90%	96%	99%	96%	96%	69%	64%	75%	58%
Atlantic West	96%	58%	73%	84%	85%	95%	92%	92%	78%	72%	83%	61%
Bergen Central	95%	90%	98%	98%	96%	100%	96%	96%	86%	67%	86%	99%
Bergen South	98%	86%	86%	99%	98%	100%	96%	95%	84%	70%	84%	95%
Burlington East	96%	70%	64%	80%	98%	98%	85%	86%	72%	63%	83%	82%
Burlington West	98%	76%	75%	83%	93%	99%	92%	90%	78%	60%	81%	87%
Camden Central	95%	64%	69%	61%	85%	93%	84%	91%	64%	46%	63%	76%
Camden East	95%	71%	76%	67%	91%	98%	88%	96%	72%	57%	74%	99%
Camden North	87%	55%	54%	45%	96%	96%	75%	92%	73%	60%	78%	71%
Camden South	98%	84%	69%	60%	98%	97%	92%	97%	69%	71%	82%	82%
Cape May	95%	84%	77%	85%	97%	97%	91%	90%	71%	69%	81%	99%
Cumberland East	84%	62%	54%	69%	96%	95%	94%	94%	53%	56%	59%	73%
Cumberland West	95%	71%	77%	82%	94%	99%	96%	96%	78%	66%	77%	96%
Essex Central	100%	99%	88%	82%	90%	96%	92%	96%	65%	59%	70%	100%
Essex North	98%	71%	61%	58%	76%	98%	80%	92%	69%	58%	76%	97%
Essex South	96%	86%	64%	73%	89%	90%	90%	85%	68%	56%	71%	100%
Gloucester East	90%	49%	85%	82%	96%	92%	92%	90%	64%	57%	72%	52%
Gloucester West	98%	87%	81%	71%	96%	99%	98%	96%	74%	68%	82%	92%
Hudson Central	91%	69%	93%	95%	98%	98%	97%	96%	77%	76%	86%	87%
Hudson North	99%	95%	91%	90%	91%	96%	100%	97%	90%	76%	85%	99%
Hudson South	98%	67%	82%	70%	95%	97%	96%	95%	75%	66%	80%	94%
Hudson West	97%	81%	95%	86%	98%	97%	90%	90%	79%	62%	72%	98%
Hunterdon	99%	88%	91%	94%	96%	100%	82%	90%	82%	61%	78%	100%
Mercer North	97%	81%	98%	94%	95%	98%	97%	93%	78%	69%	83%	95%
Mercer South	97%	71%	90%	93%	94%	97%	90%	94%	75%	65%	79%	98%
Middlesex Central	98%	89%	58%	84%	100%	96%	89%	94%	76%	54%	76%	96%
Middlesex Coastal	99%	95%	85%	86%	94%	98%	99%	97%	78%	59%	80%	89%
Middlesex West	97%	80%	81%	80%	81%	92%	95%	95%	64%	57%	73%	95%
Monmouth North	95%	71%	67%	77%	97%	99%	96%	89%	57%	58%	65%	60%
Monmouth South	98%	74%	75%	71%	98%	100%	93%	93%	71%	57%	75%	46%
Morris East	98%	91%	88%	91%	89%	100%	100%	97%	82%	69%	85%	96%
Morris West	97%	73%	65%	66%	85%	95%	92%	91%	66%	61%	81%	88%
Newark Center City	93%	84%	64%	73%	86%	95%	85%	91%	63%	51%	66%	92%
Newark Northeast	92%	80%	87%	82%	91%	97%	94%	92%	80%	67%	83%	79%
Newark South	90%	86%	92%	88%	93%	99%	95%	88%	58%	49%	67%	76%
Ocean North	97%	62%	78%	78%	88%	94%	95%	95%	74%	70%	82%	92%
Ocean South	98%	78%	73%	75%	96%	97%	92%	95%	67%	64%	76%	81%
Passaic Central	97%	51%	68%	75%	91%	99%	90%	89%	66%	64%	77%	50%
Passaic North	98%	85%	83%	79%	96%	99%	95%	95%	72%	67%	78%	83%
Salem	96%	55%	55%	55%	78%	96%	96%	96%	76%	65%	81%	82%
Somerset	98%	74%	69%	83%	93%	99%	89%	95%	74%	70%	76%	96%
Sussex	98%	83%	66%	72%	98%	98%	95%	97%	67%	66%	79%	90%
Union Central	94%	76%	89%	89%	91%	96%	94%	95%	67%	61%	68%	98%
Union East	96%	77%	85%	91%	89%	99%	93%	93%	74%	67%	83%	99%
Union West	98%	85%	97%	82%	90%	100%	97%	87%	78%	62%	76%	100%
Warren	95%	75%	70%	63%	93%	91%	81%	83%	61%	66%	72%	98%
Statewide	96%	76%	78%	79%	93%	97%	92%	93%	72%	63%	77%	86%

Measure #	Description of the Measure	Final Target	Time Period Analyzed
M# 3b	Timeliness of Response (investigations commenced in required response time)	98%	Jun '14 - May '15
M# 4	Timeliness of Completion (investigations in 60 days)	98%	Apr '14 - Mar '15
M# 7a.	FTM (initial)	90%	May '14 - Apr '15
M# 7b.	FTM (quarterly)	90%	Jun '14 - May '15
M# 10	Case Plans (initial)	95%	May '14 - Apr '15
M# 11	Case Plans (ongoing)	95%	Jun '14 - May '15
M# 16	Wkr-Child Visits (first 2 months OOHP)	95%	Apr '14 - Mar '15
M# 17	Monthly Wkr-Child Visits at the Placement Site (Includes Out of State Children)	98%	Jun '14 - May '15
M# 18	Wkr-Parent Visits (Reunification goal; 2x monthly)	95%	Jun '14 - May '15
M# 20a ¹	Parent-Child Visits (weekly) Average weekly visits for 12 weeks.	60%	3/14/15 - 5/30/15
M# 20b	Parent-Child Visits (bi-weekly)	85%	Jun '14 - May '15
Intake Caseload	Intake Worker Caseload	95%	Jun '14 - May '15

¹Compliance for Parent-Child Weekly Visits is now measured by percent of children with weekly visits averaged over 12 weeks.

The data contained in this dashboard is considered preliminary and as a result, these figures might be different than the final reported figures. The data is produced for continuous quality improvement across DCF.