

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

<b>Demonstration Site:</b>  <b>Sacramento</b>	<b>Reporting Period:</b>  <b>Calendar Year 2012</b>
<b>County Contact:</b>  <b>Name: Geri Wilson</b>  <b>Phone: (916) 337-7222</b> <b>Email: egwilson@sbcglobal.net</b>	

Instructions: Pursuant to the legislative requirements for implementing RBS, each county participating in the RBS Demonstration Project shall prepare and submit an annual report. The report is to be developed in collaboration with the private nonprofit agency(ies) participating in the demonstration project. This County Annual Report (CAR) is to be prepared by the county as a single, comprehensive report for the reporting period. The report is prepared for each calendar year in which the RBS Reform Project is in operation and submitted by March 1 of the following year to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) at [RBSreform@dss.ca.gov](mailto:RBSreform@dss.ca.gov).

**Section A - Client Outcomes:**

1. Complete the table below on the characteristics of the target population served in this reporting period.

<b>Total Number Of Youth:</b>	<b>Average Age Of Youth:</b>	<b>Number Of Youth Who Are:</b>	<b>Number Of Youth Who Are:</b>	<b>Number Of Youth Placed By:</b>
42	15.6 yrs	Male: 23 Female: 19	African-American: 16 Asian: 3 Caucasian: 13 Hispanic: 2 Other: 8	Probation: 17 Child Welfare: 25 Mental Health: 0 Other: 0

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

- 2. Complete and attach one excel document titled, “RBS Days of Care Schedule” for each RBS provider listing information for each youth enrolled in RBS since implementation of the project. This document captures information on the total days in care in residential, community-based bridge care, after-care and crisis stabilization, beginning with the youth’s initial enrollment in RBS.**
- a. For those youth who were both active in RBS during the reporting period and enrolled in RBS long enough to meet or exceed the approved placement, what percent exceeded the site target for average length of stay in group home residential placement and by an average of how many days?**

The majority of youth enrolled in RBS during this report period who exited residential care and transitioned to community based care exceeded the target for average length of stay in residential placement.

Of the 3 youth enrolled in Martin’s Achievement Place during the report period who were active in RBS long enough to meet or exceed the approved site target for average length of stay in residential care, 1 youth (33%) exited within the approved target site for average length of stay in residential care. The other 2 youth’s stay in the residential care component exceeded the targeted average by 185 days. This data includes length of stay information for one youth who had transitioned to the community and returned to group home care.

Of the 13 youth enrolled in the Children’s Receiving Home of Sacramento who were active in RBS long enough to meet or exceed the approved site target for average length of stay in residential care, 5 youth met the target for the average length of stay in residential care. Eight (8) youth or 61% did not meet the target and exceeded the target by an average of 191 days. This data includes length of stay information for one youth who had transitioned to the community and returned to residential care.

Of the 4 youth enrolled in Quality Group Homes during the report period who were active in RBS long enough to meet or exceed the approved site target for average lengths of stay in residential care, 100% exceeded the target average. The target was exceeded by an average of 197 days. This data includes length of stay information for one youth who returned to residential care after initially transitioning to community based care and another youth has a plan for emancipation from group care.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

- b. For those youth who exited (for any reason) from the RBS program during the reporting period, what percent exceeded the approved site target for average length of stay in the full RBS program (residential plus community) and by an average of how many days?**

A total of 21 youth have exited from the RBS program during this report period.

A total of 7 youth exited from Martin's Achievement Place. Of those 7, 4 youth exited within the 540 day targeted total length of stay and 3 youth representing 43% did not exit by the targeted average. The target average was exceeded by 134 days.

A total of 5 youth exited from the Children's Receiving Home of Sacramento. Of those 5, 3 youth, representing 60%, did not exit by the target average of 540 days. The target average was exceeded by 59 days.

A total of 9 youth exited from Quality Group Homes. Of those 9, 2 youth, representing 22%, did not exit by the target average of 540 days. The target average was exceeded by 112 days.

- c. What number and percent of youth stepped down from group home residential placement to a lower level of care during the reporting period? Of those youth who stepped down, what number and percent returned to group home residential care? For any youth who stepped down to a lower level of care and returned to group home residential care multiple times, describe the number of youth and the reasons for each movement up and down in level of care.**

A total of 21 youth exited the group home residential component of RBS during this report period. Of those 21 youth, 14, representing 66%, stepped down to a lower level of care.

A total of 6 youth exited the residential component of Martin's Achievement Place. Four of those youth exited to a lower level of care. One youth returned to group home care when his permanency placement with his parent was not successful

A total of 10 youth exited the residential component of the Children's Receiving Home of Sacramento. Eight of those youth exited to a lower level of care. One youth returned to group home care when her permanency option with her mother was not successful.

At total of 5 youth exited the residential component of Quality Group Homes. Two of those youth stepped down to a lower level of care. One youth returned to group home care when the permanency placement with his parent was not successful.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

- d. Of those youth active in RBS during the reporting period, what number and percent exited from RBS due to graduation, emancipation, voluntary closure, and other (as defined by “Current Status Code” in the RBS Days of Care Schedule)? Of those exiting as “other”, describe the reasons for disenrollment.**

Of those youth active in RBS during this reporting period, a total of 20 youth exited the the program. A breakdown of the exit percentages and reasons is as follows:

Graduation- 12 (60%)

Emancipation- 1 (5%)

Other- 7- (35%)

The reason for the 7 youth who exited for “other” reasons is as follows:

Probation violation and incarceration- 3

Extended AWOL- 2

Severe behavioral acting out creating danger to self or others- 2

It is important to note that of the 12 youth who exited the program through graduation, 11 were in permanent placements with bio family or relatives.

- e. Of those youth who exited from RBS since implementation of the RBS program, what number and percent re-enrolled in RBS during this reporting period?**

There were no re-enrollments of youth into the Sacramento RBS Program during this reporting period.

- f. What percent of youth utilized crisis stabilization services during the reporting period? Of those youth, what was the average number of episodes of crisis stabilization per youth? List the reasons why the crisis stabilization episode occurred:**

Of the 42 youth that were served in RBS during this reporting period, 4 youth, representing 9%, utilized crisis stabilization during 2012. Two of the youth had 2 episodes of crisis stabilization and 2 youth had 1 episode.

Crisis stabilization was utilized for youth who had moved to community based care that were having difficulty stabilizing in their permanent placement. Most often, the youth’s family situation changed in a way that resulted in the youth not receiving the level of supervision and support necessary for continued success in the community. Two of the 4 youth were able to return to community based care after receiving crisis stabilization services.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

It is important to note that Crisis Stabilization services are not available for RBS youth served in the Juvenile Justice System as the Juvenile Court regards even the temporary nature of the placement as placement commitment which cannot happen without formal Court proceedings.

**Section B - Client Involvement:**

- 1. Using the Child and Adolescence Needs and Strengths (CANS) data provided by Walter R. McDonald and Associates, Inc. (WRMA), address the following:**

- a. Describe any trends indicated by the CANS data.**

The 2012 CANS data for youth enrolled in the Sacramento RBS program shows that over time, on the average, the level of need for youth in all of the assessed life domains decreased with the exception of the Functional Status and Substance Use Complications domains. The CANS data also showed that the most significant improvement occurred in the Risk Behaviors, Family/Caregiver Needs and Strengths, Child Strengths, Child Safety and Educational Progress. In all of the domains, with the exception of Functional Status and Substance Use Complications, some progress, although small, was noted at the first CANS follow-up and improvement continued through Follow-up 3.

- b. Can any conclusions be made from the data? If yes, what are they? If no, why not?**

**[ X ] Yes [ ] No Explain:**

Although it is understood that the number of youth participating in the evaluation is small and that caution needs to be taken in arriving at decisive conclusions, it does seem that the array of individualized RBS services and the aftercare services to the youth and family are reducing the level of need for the majority of youth and families enrolled in the RBS program for an extended period of time. As stated in 1a. above the most gains appear to be in the areas of Risk Behaviors, Family/Caregiver Needs and Strengths, Child Strengths, Child Safety and Educational Progress.

The evaluation data does align with the observable and noted progress of the youth and the feedback from the families that are served in the RBS Program. For the youth that do graduate from the program there is noted improvement in those behaviors that place the youth at risk, i.e., AWOL, self-injury, assaultiveness. There has also been observed gains in the caregiver's ability to successfully parent the youth and the overall stability in the families of youth who graduate from the program. Additionally although many of the youth who enter the RBS Program have educational challenges and are not performing at grade level, there has been marked improvement in many of the youth's educational progress during their enrollment in RBS. Youth graduating from the RBS Program also

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

seem to have age appropriate goals, are getting along well with family and friends and future oriented.

The Sacramento RBS Program partners believe that the gains experienced by youth who graduate from the RBS Program and their families that are referenced above, and illustrated by the data, are supported by the following array of RBS services and supports:

1. Consistent family and youth engagement efforts and a residential milieu that is welcoming and open to families
2. Youth and family participation in care and service planning throughout the youth's enrollment in RBS.
3. Comprehensive care planning that aligns goals and objectives and involves and draws upon the expertise of all service partners.
4. Intensive treatment focused on helping the youth stabilize and manage difficult behaviors.
5. Parallel residential and community based services to develop and enhance the youth's ties to their community.
6. Aftercare services that support the youth and family's success after the youth's transition to the community.
7. Youth and family advocates who are available to support the youth and family throughout the youth's enrollment in RBS.

**2. a. Complete the table below on family and youth participation in child/family team meetings during the reporting period.**

<b>Total Number Of Youth:</b>	<b>Total Number Of Youth With At Least One Supportive Adult During Any Part Of The Reporting Period:</b>	<b>Number Of Youth Participating In At Least 90% Of Their Child/Family Team Meetings:</b>	<b>Number Of Youth With At Least One Supportive Adult Participating In At Least 90% Of That Youth's Child/Family Team Meetings:</b>
38	38	38	36

**b. If youth did not participate, explain why not.**

All youth enrolled in the Sacramento County RBS Program routinely attended the child/family team meetings during their enrollment. There were occasions when youth would elect not to participate in full meetings or, on occasion, would miss a meeting, but those instances were exceptions.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

**Section C - Client Satisfaction:**

1. **Using the Youth Services Survey for Youth (YSS) and Youth Services Survey for Families (YSS-F) data provided by WRMA, specifically satisfaction measured in Items 1-15 of the YSS and YSS-F and outcomes measured in Items 16-22 of the YSS and YSS-F, address the following:**

- a. **Describe any trends in the data.**

The data from the Youth Satisfaction Survey (YSS) indicates that, on the average, youth fell in the 3.4-3.5 range at the baseline in the areas of Satisfaction with Services, Child and Family Voice and Choice and Well-Being. Those scores remained fairly unchanged at each follow-up with the exception of Follow-up 3 in which the 2 reporting youth average 4.5.

The data from the Youth Satisfaction Survey for Families (YSS-F) showed that on the average participating families rated Satisfaction w/Services a 4.5 at baseline. Child and Family Voice and Choice and Well-Being fell just a bit lower on the average at 4.1. In the last Follow-up 2, the averages in each of the domains were at 4.5.

- b. **Can any conclusions be made from the data? If yes, what are they? If no, why not?**

**Yes  No Explain:**

Again, although the number of youth and families participating in the evaluation was relatively small, the data does show a pretty consistent trend in which youth showed, at the onset of enrollment, some satisfaction in each of the areas evaluated, the area of satisfaction remained stable until the final follow-up in which the graduating youth rated their satisfaction in each of the areas higher.

The family's participating in RBS, showed a high satisfaction with Satisfaction w/Services, Child and Family Voice and Choice and Well-being at the onset of services, remained consistent with their rating throughout the youth's enrollment and then showing, although slight, additional improvement at Follow-up 2.

The data does reflect the feedback that youth and families have provided throughout the operation of the RBS Program. Youth, upon graduation can cite areas of satisfaction with the program, but will also talk about areas where they would have liked to have seen fewer rules, more consistent respect from staff, etc. The families, in contrast, have consistently expressed appreciation for the openness of the program to families, for the support that the program has provided to the family and the responsiveness of the program staff to youth and family need. The high satisfaction scores from families in the evaluation is consistent with the family's reported experience.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

**Section D - County and Provider Use of RBS Program:**

1. a. **During the reporting period, has the operation of the program significantly changed from the original design described in the approved plan? If yes, describe the change.**

Yes  No **Explain:**

The significant changes that have been made to the Sacramento County RBS Program during this reporting period are primarily related to broadening the eligibility criteria for youth considered for program enrollment. Consensus was reached by county agency and provider partners to modify the eligibility criteria to also include youth who did not have a permanency option at the time of enrollment. Previous enrollment criteria required youth to have an adult who was willing to come forward to be a permanency option for the youth and actively participate in the RBS Program. The decision to change the criteria was reached after operational experience revealed that, even when youth entered the program with a viable permanency option, changes in the youth's and family's situation frequently resulted in the permanency option falling away. When that occurred, there was no back-up plan for the youth and often youth experienced a profound setback in their treatment progress.

Along with the described change in the youth eligibility criteria, came the realization that both concurrent planning and family finding efforts would need to be developed and/or strengthened in an effort to ensure the best possible permanency outcomes for youth enrolled in the program and to help prevent the major setback for youth whose permanency option fell away. Subsequently, each RBS provider has trained their staff in family finding and has a system in place to conduct family finding activities as a part of concurrent planning and family finding.

An additional change occurred as an exception when a youth enrolled in the Quality Group Homes RBS program asked, after the permanency option with his parent fell through, that his services focus on supporting his emancipation from the system. Although a permanency program, given the youth's age and fact that was approaching age 18 within just a matter of months, his Comprehensive Care Plan was modified to meet his changed need for emancipation preparedness.

- b. If yes, how has this adaptation impacted the effectiveness of the project?**

During the 2012 reporting period, there has been only 1 youth that has been enrolled in the RBS program who has not had an identified permanency option, so the change in the eligibility criteria has yet to significantly impact the effectiveness of the project. However, as these referrals increase and the providers have more experience with concurrent planning and family finding, it is believed that the permanency outcomes for

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

the youth who entered the program without a permanency option can be comparable to those youth who entered with a permanency option. It is also expected that by broadening the referral criteria in this manner will help to address the referral and census issues that have plagued the Sacramento County RBS Program since its inception.

The youth whose plan was changed from permanency to emancipation has done well in the program and is on target to meet this goal during the early part of 2013. The flexibility of the program and the provider to tailor services to his needs as he aged in the system, served to support success in the residential component of the program and prepare him for living independently in the community.

- 2. During the reporting period, have there been any significant differences from the roles and responsibilities delineated in the approved plan for the various county agencies and provider(s)? If yes, describe the differences.**

Yes  No **Explain:**

As noted in Section D1.a, each Sacramento County RBS provider has implemented Family Finding activities and integrated that responsibility into the roles and responsibilities of various agency staff. This function was not originally included in the funding or program model design and includes strategies such as search, engagement and relationship building.

Although not a significant difference from the roles and responsibilities delineated in the approved plan for the county and provider agencies, it is important to note that the Functional Family Therapist (FFT) for Martin's Achievement Place, extended her role during this reporting period to provide FFT to families served by the Receiving Home RBS program when the FFT therapist for that RBS provider was suddenly unavailable. A similar situation occurred during the previous reporting period when the same therapist extended services to the families served by Quality Group Homes under similar circumstances. These arrangements were made with the support of Mental Health and speaks to the strong RBS practice community that has been created in Sacramento County to ensure that there is continuity of services for all youth and families enrolled in the RBS program

- 3. Were RBS enrollments sufficient during the reporting period? If not, why not?**

Yes  No **Explain:**

The RBS enrollments during this reporting period, as in the previous reporting period, have not been close to sufficient for most of the reporting period. Although referrals and enrollments have increased toward the latter part of the year for the Children's Receiving Home and Quality Group Homes, a lack of referrals earlier in the year has made it difficult for the partner agencies to keep their programs fully staffed and able to provide the full array of services and resources.

## Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

Martin's Achievement Place, a specialized program for youth who are acting out sexually, has been significantly impacted by the low referrals and program census and received only 2 referrals and enrollments during 2012.

A number of efforts have been made to ensure the RBS providers are treated as preferred providers by CPS and Probation, the referring agencies. There have been social marketing efforts that have occurred on multiple occasions throughout the year with all providers participating to educate placement staff about their programs. Both CPS and Probation have looked at their system's gateways to placements to ensure that referrals that meet the criteria do get referred to RBS. The referral criteria were broadened as described in Section D.1a in an effort to increase the population of youth that would meet eligibility criteria. Additionally, agency and provider gatekeepers have acted to identify and track potential referrals and support the referral process in whatever way is needed to remove any referral challenges or barriers.

It is recognized that, even though RBS has demonstrated positive outcomes for youth who are enrolled in the program and their families, referrals and enrollments must increase if RBS is to be a viable program in Sacramento County. This issue will continue to have priority attention during 2013.

#### **4. Describe how the county and provider(s) managed RBS staff resources during the reporting period (e.g., filling vacancies, redefining job qualifications, eliminating positions, etc.)**

The county has continued to provide a part-time RBS Coordinator to oversee RBS program operations and coordinate implementation activities. Additionally, the county has designated 2 RBS social workers and 1 probation officer to serve the RBS youth and their families and participate as a member of the FST for each youth in their RBS caseload.

Although Martin's Achievement Place (MAP) had a very low census throughout 2012, there were no vacancies or reductions in staff during the reporting period. The entire RBS team at MAP participated in family finding training and the Family Advocate and Family Specialist have taken on the lead role in Family Finding.

The Children's Receiving Home of Sacramento (CRH) RBS ended the reporting period with a team consisting of; 1 PTE 0.5 Clinical Program Manager, 2 FTE Comprehensive Care Coordinators, 1 PTE 0.5 Family Partner, 1 PTE 0.5 Youth Advocate, 1 FTE Behavioral Intervention Specialist, and 7-8 FTE Residential Counselors (1 to 4 ratio). Due to the original RBS Residential Supervisor (RS) parting with the agency in March, another RS is covering supervision responsibilities of the Residential Counselors. The Family Specialist position was eliminated for fiscal reasons and that team member has become the BIS.

CRH experienced turnover with our FFT therapist which resulted in CRH obtaining use of the FFT therapist from Martin's Achievement Place. Although not "ideal" to not have

## Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

an in-house person to provide the service, the sharing of an FFT provider did allow for an increase in FFT fidelity with regards to the FFT model standards that are in practice. The collaboration went well and the FFT therapist was available when needed for coordination of care. CRH is in the process of hiring a FFT therapist for 2013.

CRH has seen a turnover of Residential Counselors, some of which were agency led decisions. Filling those slots with appropriate candidates proved challenging and the turnover was disruptive to program's relationship with youth and families. The clinical team made efforts to support youth and their families when these disruptions occurred.

Quality Group Homes continues to operate with the following staff members who are essential to the vitality of the RBS program: 1 PTE 0.15 Program Director, 1 PTE 0.25 Clinical Director, 1 FTE Comprehensive Care Coordinator, 1 FTE Behavioral Specialist, 1 PTE 0.5 Family Partner, 1 FTE Residential Supervisor, 1 PTE 0.5 Residential Manager, 7 FTE Residential Counselors, 1 PTE 0.5 Family Functional Therapist, 1 PTE 0.15 Individual Therapist, 1 PTE 0.5 Youth/Family Specialist, 1 PTE 0.5 Youth Mentor, 1 FTE Program Aid, 1 PTE 0.1 Psychiatrist and 1 PTE 0.5 Educational Specialist.

QGH has continued to operate under the RBS model and has kept the integrity of the program in sight. This year, several factors, including turnover, maternity leave and having consistently low referrals resulted in the need to utilize existing personnel to temporarily cover and assume additional responsibilities of other positions. Positions that became vacant included our Comprehensive Care Coordinator, Behavioral Specialist, Clinical Supervisor, Youth/Family Specialist and Youth Mentor. QGH was able to utilize our Residential Manager to cover the duties of the Comprehensive Care Coordinator. We successfully rehired for the Behavioral Specialist. Duties of the Clinical Supervisor were turned over to the Clinical Director. The duties of the Youth/Family Specialist were transferred to the Family Partner. Positions that we continue to hold open are the Community Specialist and the Youth Mentor. Our Behavior Specialist and Family Partner have filled several tasks of the Community Specialist and also of the Youth Mentor.

### **Section E - County Payments to Nonprofit Agency(ies):**

Note: The payments reported here are from the county records as recorded on a cash basis during the reporting period from January 1 to December 31, for all providers participating in the RBS demonstration project.

1. **For Questions a through c, please complete the table below:**
  - a. **Report the total payments from all fund sources paid to the provider(s) for RBS during the period the report covers under each of the following:**
    - **Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC). (The amounts reported here should come from the amount reported under H1, amount claimed per fiscal tracking sheet.**

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

They will not be equal because H1 is cumulative for the project and F1 is only for the reporting year.)

- Early, Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT).
  - Mental Health Services Act (MHSA).
  - Grants, loans, other. (Itemize any amounts reported by source.)
- b. Provide the Average Months of Stay in Group Care for all children/youth enrolled in group home care during the reporting period.
- c. Provide the Average Months of Stay in Community Care for all children/youth enrolled in community services (not in group home) during the reporting period.

	AFDC-FC	EPSDT	MHSA	Other	Total
<b>Amount Paid for Residential</b>	\$1,309,077	\$351,408	\$	\$	\$1,660,485
<b>Amount Paid for Community</b>	\$159,540	\$176,664	\$	\$	\$336,204
<b>Total Amount Paid</b>	\$1,468,617	\$528,072	\$	\$	\$1,996,689
<b>Avg. Length of Stay in Residential</b>	228 (7088 days divided by 31 youth*)	–	–	–	
<b>Avg. Length of Stay in Community</b>	191 (3829 days divided by 20)	–	–	–	
<b>Avg. AFDC-FC Payment Per Youth in Residential</b>	\$40,909	–	–	–	\$40,909
<b>Avg. AFDC-FC Payment per Youth in Community</b>	\$6,937	–	–	–	\$6,937

\*Three youths who returned to Residential care from Community Based care were treated as outliers and not included in the average length of stay.

\*\*It is also important to note that these averages are based on youth being in the program and different components of the program for varying periods of time during this report period.

\*\*\*The reported EPSDT revenue is based on provisional unit rates. When Providers cost settle, the actual amount paid to a Provider can be higher.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

2. Were any changes made to the Funding Model in order to manage payment shortfalls/overages, incentives, refunds during the reporting period? If yes, explain what the changes were and why they were needed.

Yes  No Explain:

There were no changes made to the Funding Model in order to manage payment shortfall/overages, incentives or refunds during the reporting period.

**Section F - Actual Costs of Nonprofit Agency(ies):**

Note: The amounts reported here should be based on each provider's accounting records for RBS for the period from January 1 through December 31, and be on a basis consistent with the method used to report costs on the annual A-133 Financial Audit Report and SR3 document filed with CDSS.

1. a. For residential costs, complete the table below displaying provider actual costs during the reporting period, compared to the RBS proposed budget included in the approved Funding Model. If there is more than one provider in the demonstration project, combine the individual provider data into one table for the project.

Note: This chart follows the SR-3 financial report. Definitions are listed in the instructions (RBS Letter No. 04-11, dated August 16, 2011).

**Actual Costs in RBS Residential:**

Expenditures:	Proposed Budget for the Period	Actuals for the Period	Over/(Under) Budget
Total Salaries & Benefits	\$1,563,316	\$1,008,467	\$(554,849)
Total Operating Costs	\$207,633	\$212,500	\$(4,867)
Total Child Care & Supervision Costs	\$1,770,949	\$1, 220,967	\$(549,982)
Total Mental Health Treatment Services Costs	\$601,762	\$468,445	\$(133,317)
Total Social Work Activity, Treatment & Family Support Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Indirect Costs	\$182,039	\$194,656	\$12,617
Total Expenditures	\$2,554,750	\$1,884,068	\$(670,892)

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

- b. Does the difference between the actual provider costs and the proposed budget exceed 5 percent on any line item above? If yes, explain what caused the variance and whether this difference is expected to be temporary or permanent.

Yes  No Explain:

The Proposed costs exceed the Actuals due to the fact that all providers were operating at significantly less than 90% capacity and the budget projections were made under the assumption that the programs would be at least 90% capacity. The providers also indicated that because the RBS Program was a pilot and they have had little experience budgeting for the Program, it was difficult to accurately project Total Indirect Costs which resulted in the Actuals for the Period exceeding 5% of what was projected.

2. a. For community costs, complete the table below displaying provider actual costs during the reporting period, compared to the RBS proposed budget included in the approved Funding Model. If there is more than one provider in the demonstration project, combine the individual provider data into one table for the project.

Note: This chart follows the SR-3 financial report. Definitions are listed in the instructions (RBS Letter No. 04-11, dated August 16, 2011).

**Actual Costs in RBS Community:**

Expenditures:	Proposed Budget for the Period	Actuals for the Period	Over/(Under) Budget
Total Salaries & Benefits	\$498,589	\$269,145	\$(243,844)
Total Operating Costs	\$91,453	\$73,103	\$(18,350)
Total Child Care & Supervision Costs	\$590,042	\$342,248	\$(247,794)
Total Mental Health Treatment Services Costs	\$220,530	\$162,328	\$(57,292)
Total Social Work Activity, Treatment & Family Support Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Indirect Costs	\$51,940	\$58,134	\$6,194
Total Expenditures	\$862,512	\$563,710	\$(298,802)

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

- b. Does the difference between the actual provider costs and the proposed budget exceed 5 percent on any line item above? If yes, explain what caused the variance and whether this difference is expected to be temporary or permanent.**

Yes  No Explain:

The providers based the Proposed Costs on the assumption that their programs would be at 90% capacity. All of the Sacramento RBS Programs were significantly below capacity during the reporting period resulting in the Actual costs being much less than the projections. The RBS providers also indicated, as was true for the projection of the Residential Indirect Costs that it was difficult to accurately project those costs for the Community Based Care component of RBS because the program was new.

- 3. Were there extraordinary costs associated with any particular child/youth (i.e., outliers as defined in the Funding Model)? If yes, provide the amount of the cost and describe what it purchased.**

Yes  No Explain:

The Children's Receiving Home reported that there were some extraordinary costs for some youth, i.e., rental support for parents (\$1,600), travel costs for families and staff (\$200) and cell phone assistance (\$100)

- 4. Has the county performed the fiscal audit required by the memorandum of understanding? If yes, describe any problems/issues with the provider's operations or implementation of the Funding Model that were disclosed by the fiscal audit performed. If no, when will that audit occur?**

Yes  No Explain:

This Fiscal Audit for Martin's Achievement Place was completed. When costs for a requested psychological exam were not covered under a mental health plan, the costs were submitted under AFDC-FC. The costs were disallowed in the audit. The County Auditor Controller's Office requested guidance from the State to develop a rationale that would support providers in spending funding flexibly, even on an exception basis, to meet the needs of youth and families. CDSS guidance did not support the provider in what is believed to be the spirit of AB1453. As a result, the audit finding stands as, per CDSS instruction, the County Auditor Controller audited only to regulation without consideration of exception for AB1453. The lack of rationale or support for flexible spending will impede the provider's ability to fully meet the individual and unique needs of youth and families in the RBS Reform Pilot.

The County Auditor also completed the fiscal audit for Quality Group Homes. The

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

majority of the 7 areas reviewed resulted in the Auditor not noting areas of concern or issues that required attention. However, there was a finding that, although QGH maintained RBS expenditures separately from other program expenditures, there was concern related to general ledger and RBS program cost. In response, the Auditor recommended that QGH obtain sufficient knowledge for RBS program cost reporting requirements by attending training and/or contacting appropriate granting agencies to properly report the RBS program costs. Additionally, concern was noted regarding QGH's non-payroll expenditure and it was recommended that QGH should maintain adequate supporting documentation for all RBS program costs and that QGH should not include the costs related to fines and penalties as RBS program costs in the future.

The fiscal audit for the Children's Receiving Home is in progress, but has not been finalized.

**Section G - Impact on AFDC-FC Costs:**

- This is a cumulative report from the beginning of the project. Amounts reported are based on the amounts included in the claim presented to CDSS. Using the RBS claim fiscal tracking sheets, please complete the information below for all children served by RBS from the start of the project to the end of the reporting period:**

**RBS Payments for All Children Enrolled in RBS from the start of the project through the end of the Reporting Period:**

Total Children Served In RBS: <u>47*</u>	Total:	Federal:	State:	County:
<b>Federal Payments:</b>				
Residential:	\$2,249,233	\$1,087,908	\$117,283	\$1,044,042
Community:	\$571,696	\$	\$	\$571,696
<b>Total Federal Payments:</b>	\$			
<b>Non-federal Payments:</b>				
Residential:	\$700,157	\$	\$83,614	\$616,543
Community:	\$144,029	\$	\$	\$144,029
<b>Total Non-federal Payments:</b>	\$844,186			
<b>Total RBS Payments</b>	\$3,665,115			

\*Includes six youths in November and December with no payment issues.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

Note: It is possible to have federal funds used in the Non-federal Payment (i.e., non-federal RBS children) category. These payments would be the federal share of any Emergency Assistance Funding used in the RBS program up to the first 12 months of a child's stay in RBS. The amounts reported would come from the non-federal fiscal tracking sheet, and are based on the instructions provided in RBS Letter No. 03-11, dated June 21, 2011.

**2. Of the children reported in G1 above, please complete the information below for all children who successfully entered and exited RBS in 24 months, or remained in RBS for a full 24 months.**

Note: When completing G2, it is important to understand how G2, G3, and G4 work to form the comparison to regular AFDC-FC costs. Section G4 is a comparison of cost for those children who have completed RBS (from G2) to the cost of regular foster care based on the target group base period (G3). In this context, a child "completing RBS" is one who has either entered the program and then exited after successfully completing his/her RBS program goal, or one who has entered the program and remained in the program longer than the base period (24 months). The comparison in Section G4 is done only for those children who have successfully completed the RBS program goal or are still in the program at the 24 month mark. The count of children for Section G2 and the related costs are only for those children who have completed the RBS program or remained in RBS longer than 24 months. For example, a child entering RBS who remains in the program for only three months and then is disenrolled would not be included in G2. A child entering RBS and still in the program at month 26 would be included in G2.

**RBS Payments for all Children Entering and Exiting RBS in the 24 month Period or remaining in the program for longer than 24 months. (Include all children meeting this condition from the beginning of the project.):**

<b>Total Children Completing RBS: <u>  13  </u></b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>Federal:</b>	<b>State:</b>	<b>County:</b>
<b>Federal Payments:</b>				
<b>Residential:</b>	\$815,618	\$428,177	\$60,189	\$327,252
<b>Community:</b>	\$395,784	\$	\$	\$395,784
<b>Total Federal Payments:</b>	\$			
<b>Non-federal Payments:</b>				
<b>Residential:</b>	\$189,312	\$	\$42,564	\$146,748
<b>Community:</b>	\$109,751	\$	\$	\$109,751
<b>Total Non-federal Payments:</b>	\$299,063			
<b>Total RBS Payments:</b>	\$1,510,465			

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

3. Using the approved Attachment A from the Funding Model and the number of children reported in G2 (above), complete the information below regarding the expected base Foster Care costs for RBS target population children that otherwise would have been served in Foster Care.

Note: Since Section G3 of the CAR is used to compare the base AFDC-FC rates had the RBS youth remained in regular foster care, the "Approved Base Rate Per Child" is the weighted average of AFDC-FC payments for Rate Classification Level (RCL) 12 and RCL 14 placements as described and approved in the Funding Model. The "Approved Base Months in Regular Foster Care" section is the approved comparison length for the RBS youth had they remained in regular foster care. For all RBS counties, the approved base months in regular foster care is 24 months, based on the demographic for the current length of stay in a group home for the target group. The "Applicable Federal Funds Rate" is the percentage of federal funds rate based on the federal medical assistance percentage (FMAP) used in the RBS claim. The CAR template has this FMAP funding rate pre-loaded at 50 percent because all of the RBS Funding Models used the pre-American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) FMAP rate of 50 percent for approval purposes. However, because Section G1 of the CAR instructs counties to use financial costs based on the RBS Fiscal Tracking sheets, counties must use the ARRA rate in effect for that month and quarter. For the months through and including December 2010, the ARRA rate is 56.2 percent. For the months beginning January 2011, the ARRA rate will decline until it reaches 50 percent beginning July 2011. Details on the ARRA rates used in the RBS claim are in an RBS claim letter. In order to produce a correct comparison of costs between sections G1, G2, and G3, whatever federal funds rate is used in Section G1 should be the same rate used for G2 and G3.

**Note: If zero have completed, enter zero for this reporting period comparison.**

<b>AFDC-FC Base for Comparison:</b>				
	<b>Approved Base Rate Per Child:</b>	<b>\$ 8031</b>		
	<b>Number of Children Completing RBS:</b>	<b>13</b>		(from H2, above)
	<b>Approved Base Months in Regular Foster Care:</b>	<b>24</b>		
	<b>Applicable Federal Funds Rate:</b>	<b>50%</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>Federal</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>County</b>
<b>Base Payment for Target Group:</b>	<b>\$2,505,672</b>	<b>\$915,460</b>	<b>\$636,085</b>	<b>\$954,127</b>

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

4. a. For those children who have completed the RBS program, using the information from G2 and G3 above, subtract G3 from G2 and complete the following information:

	Total	Federal	State	County
RBS Incremental Cost/(Savings)Based On Program Completion:	\$ (995,207)	\$ (487,283)	\$ (533,332)	\$ 25,408

\*\*\*Note: State Fund available through June 2011 only. County include 2011 Realignment Fund and County since July 2011.

- b. What aspects of operating RBS contributed to the cost/savings compared to regular Foster Care?

The aspects of operating RBS that contributed most to the cost/savings compared to regular foster care is that each RBS Program partners worked together to consistently provide the following array of services outlined in the RBS Program Model:

- A consistent and systemic method of Assessment and Matching
- A Comprehensive plan of Care coordinated across partner agencies
- Intensive Family Involvement supported by Family and Youth Partners
- Parallel, Pre-Discharge Community Based Interventions
- Intensive Environmentally Based Residential Services
- Therapeutic Services
- Follow-up Community Based Services and Support

The RBS partners believe that these services resulted in improved outcomes for youth and families in the area of placement stability, shorter length of stay in group home care and increased permanency. The shorter length of stay and return of youth to permanent connections ultimately resulted in significant Federal and State cost savings. As noted above, Realignment was implemented which made it difficult for the County to realize cost savings this report period.

5. Has EPSDT usage changed when compared with the typical usage by similar children/youth in traditional foster care? If yes, explain how it's different.

Yes  No Explain:

The total Medi-cal (EPSDT) funding paid to all RBS providers for the time period 1/1/12-12/31/12 was \$528,072.

Children's Receiving Home	\$245,195
Martin's Achievement Place	\$ 95, 154
Quality Group Homes	\$187,723

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

The average amount of EPSDT funds spent per youth, per month was \$1,158. This amount is lower than the previous year (\$2,693) and lower than the budgeted (funding) amount of \$2,667 per months. This lower draw down amount of EPSDT per youth was due to a decrease in referrals such that many of the youth in the program this year were in the later stages of treatment, thus needing less service.

The baseline costs for EPSDT for youth in foster care in Sacramento County was determined to be \$1,200 per month. Thus, the EPSDT billing or youth in Sacramento County RBS is on par with the typical usage of these funds for foster youth not enrolled in RBS.

- 6. Has MHSA usage changed when compared with the typical usage by similar children/youth in traditional foster care? If yes, explain how it's different.**

Yes  No **Explain:**

N/A MHSA funds are not used in the Sacramento County RBS funding model.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

**Section H - Lessons Learned:**

**1. Describe the most significant program lessons learned and best practices applied during the reporting period.**

The Sacramento RBS Program continues to learn key practice lessons from the operation of the demonstration project. The most significant lessons learned and the best practices that have emerged include:

- As reported in the last annual report, the strong collaborative partnership that exists among the key RBS stakeholders continues to be important to ensuring the fidelity to RBS values and practices as new challenges and success emerge in program operation and experience. The partnership continues to be strengthened by the existence of the Local Implementation Team (LIT) meetings and the Care Review process, each serving as the primary ways that the RBS partnership works together in a structured manner to support and grow the quality operation of the program.
- Rigorous and ongoing attention needs to be given to the census challenges that have been ongoing since inception of the demonstration project in September 2010 to ensure that the RBS providers are utilized as “preferred providers” so that providers are able to operate at a 90% capacity and to ensure that youth who are eligible for RBS are enrolled in RBS and have access to the full array of program services.
- After two full years of operation of the RBS permanency program, enough youth have now graduated from RBS to determine that the target lengths of stay of 9 months in Residential Care and 9 months in Community Based Care are being exceeded for the majority of youth served in the program through graduation. Although it is believed that both family finding and concurrent planning efforts may help to shorten the current lengths of stay, it seems unlikely given current length of stay data that the original targets will, or perhaps even should be met.
- The addition of Family Finding to the array of services provided under the RBS arc of care has already begun to provide the foundation for developing concurrent permanency plans for youth enrolled in RBS.
- The “open door” policy for families, emphasis placed on strengthening family connections and the engagement of youth and families in the decision-making and the planning process during the youth’s enrollment in RBS continues to be instrumental in giving the family and youth the hope and support to stay engaged in the permanency planning process. The availability of Family Partners and Youth Advocates continue to have an important role in the engagement process and are frequently acknowledged by graduating youth and their families as being a valuable resource that “made a difference.”
- RBS providers have learned that many of the families of youth enrolled in the RBS program have challenges and barriers that stand in the way of their ability to provide for their youth on a long-term bases and that helping families resolve some of these barriers and obtain the needed services and support is often a

## Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

primary need that must be addressed if not before, then concurrently, with the development of a permanent plan for the youth.

- Ensuring that continued efforts are made to engage the family and youth when the youth transitions to Community Based Care and that crisis plans are in place and carried out to address any regression in the youth's progress so that the successes realized in the Residential component of the program can be supported and sustained continues to be critical in supporting the youth and family's success after the "honeymoon" period is over. RBS providers have strengthened efforts to work more closely with the family during this time and adjust program services and supports as needed, with special emphasis on the youth's educational placement and stability, to help youth and families during this critical transition time.
- After some early modifications of Functional Family Therapy to fit the constructs of RBS, the evidenced based therapeutic practice continues to work well as a foundational family therapy approach for the RBS Program. Families have provided positive feedback about the approach and it is serving to support the successful transition of the youth back into family care.
- The lack of a Crisis Stabilization intervention for youth served by Probation has made it difficult to address the youth's disruption in the Community in productive ways. The Juvenile Hall is the only option for "stabilizing" disruptive behavior and that measure can damage the relationship between the provider and the youth and family.

### 2. Describe the most significant fiscal lessons learned and best practices applied during the reporting period.

The most significant fiscal lessons learned continue to be:

- The County's automated payment system (CalWIN) cannot accommodate the RBS payment rates for Residential and Community Based Care or payment to the provider when the youth has been returned to Community Based Care and the family has claimed AFDC benefits for the youth. This has resulted in the necessity of developing a cumbersome and resource intensive manually tracking and payment system for youth enrolled in RBS. If RBS is expanded to include additional youth in the future, a permanent solution to these issues would need to be developed.
- The 90% census projected in the Fiscal Model is necessary to ensure the wide array of the RBS program services and supports is consistently available throughout program operations and key to the providers' ability to fully staff their individual RBS program.
- A built in RBS rate COLA is needed to ensure the rate paid to providers is commensurate with the services provided.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project  
County Annual Report**

- Although there is significant Federal and State savings with the current RBS Fiscal Model, that savings is not passed down to the local level where the savings can be reinvested to strengthen the RBS Program. The lack of flexibility in funding requires that providers find revenues outside of AFDC-FC payments to provide the flexible kinds of services to youth and families that are critical to improving long-term outcomes.

**RBS DAYS OF CARE SCHEDULE**  
**County Annual Report -- Section A, Question 2**  
**(Revised June 2012)**

COUNTY OF Sacramento

List the youth who have been admitted to your RBS program since implementation and show how they have moved through the various stages of your program thus far (e.g. from the residential group care component, to "bridge" foster care, to reunification or another form of permanency).

**Non-Profit Corp. Name:** The Children's Receiving Home of Sacramento      **Program Number:** 0205.10.01      **Contact Person:** Geri Wilson  
**Period Covered:** Activity through..... 12/31/2012      **Telephone Number:** (916) 337-7222      **Date Completed:** 1/31/2013

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S
Youth Enrolled		RBS Residential Group Care				RBS Community-Based "Bridge" Foster Care						RBS Aftercare in Permanent Placement, including Reunification				CURRENT STATUS		
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Group Care, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In "Bridge" Foster Care, Total Days To Date	Number of RBS "Bridge" Foster Care Placements To Date	Did Child Incur Episodes For Crisis Stabilization?	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Aftercare or a Permanent Care Total Days To Date	Use Current Status Codes Below	For CLOSED Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	For OPEN Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	
1		9/16/2010	7/26/2011	313	-		-	-		no	7/26/2011	5/22/2012	301	-	4	614	-	
2		10/7/2010	6/15/2011	251	-		-	-		no	6/15/2011	10/19/2011	126	-	4	377	-	
3		10/20/2010	7/18/2012	637	-		-	-		no			-	-	6	637	-	
4		11/18/2010	7/12/2011	236	-		-	-		no	7/12/2011	6/28/2012	352	-	4	588	-	
5		1/5/2011	5/21/2012	502	-		-	-		yes			-	-	1	-	726	
6		1/27/2011	2/10/2012	379	-		-	-		no	2/10/2012	9/14/2012	217	-	4	596	-	
7		1/27/2011	5/21/2012	480	-		-	-		yes	5/21/2012		-	224	3	-	704	
8		4/22/2011	9/1/2012	498	-		-	-		no	9/1/2012		-	121	3	-	619	
9		4/25/2011	5/1/2012	372	-	5/1/2012	-	244		no			-	-	2	-	616	
10		9/8/2011	6/28/2012	294	-		-	-		no	6/28/2012	12/17/2012	172	-	4	466	-	
11		10/21/2011	12/16/2011	56	-		-	-		no			-	-	6	56	-	
12		2/9/2012		-	326		-	-		no			-	-	3	-	326	
13		4/26/2012	11/7/2012	195	-		-	-		no	11/7/2012		-	54	3	-	249	
14		5/21/2012		-	224		-	-		no			-	-	1	-	224	
15		7/25/2012	11/14/2012	112	-		-	-		no	11/14/2012		-	47	3	-	159	
16		8/8/2012	10/10/2012	63	-		-	-		no	10/10/2012		-	82	3	-	145	
17		8/21/2012		-	132		-	-		no			-	-	1	-	132	
18		9/14/2012		-	108		-	-		no			-	-	1	-	108	
19		12/11/2012		-	20		-	-		no			-	-	1	-	20	
20		12/17/2012		-	14		-	-		no			-	-	1	-	14	
21		12/20/2012		-	11		-	-		no			-	-	1	-	11	
22				-	-		-	-					-	-		-	-	
23				-	-		-	-					-	-		-	-	
24				-	-		-	-					-	-		-	-	

**Current Status Codes:**

- 1 RBS Case Open with Youth in Residential Group Care
- 2 RBS Case Open with Youth in "Bridge" Foster Care
- 3 RBS Case Open with Youth in Permanent Placement with RBS Aftercare Services
- 4 RBS Case Closed: Graduation
- 5 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation due to Emancipation
- 6 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation for Reason other than Emancipation
- 7 RBS Case Closed: Voluntary Closure
- 8 RBS Case Closed: AB 3632 Eligibility Ends

**RBS DAYS OF CARE SCHEDULE FOR CRISIS STABILIZATION**  
**County Annual Report -- Section A, Question 2**  
**(Revised June 2012)**

COUNTY OF Sacramento

List the youth who have had a Crisis Stabilization episode during the report period and show the number of days in each placement per episode. (The total number of days a client spends in Crisis Stabilization runs concurrently and is included in the total number of days in the Community component the youth was in when the Crisis Stabilization episode

**Non-Profit Corp. Name:** The Children's Receiving Home of Sacramento

**Program Number:** 0205.10.01

**Contact Person:** Gerri Wilson

**Period Covered:** Activity through..... 12/31/2012

**Telephone Number:** (916) 337-7222

**Date Completed:** 1/14/2013

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
Youth Enrolled		#1 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#2 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#3 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT			
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission		Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date
1		10/11/2012	12/9/2012	59	-	5/21/2012	6/21/2012	31	-			-	-
2		7/20/2012	8/3/2012	14	-	9/23/2012	11/22/2012	60	-			-	-
3				-	-			-	-			-	-
4				-	-			-	-			-	-
5				-	-			-	-			-	-
6				-	-			-	-			-	-
7				-	-			-	-			-	-
8				-	-			-	-			-	-
9				-	-			-	-			-	-
10				-	-			-	-			-	-
11				-	-			-	-			-	-
12				-	-			-	-			-	-
13				-	-			-	-			-	-
14				-	-			-	-			-	-
15				-	-			-	-			-	-
16				-	-			-	-			-	-
17				-	-			-	-			-	-
18				-	-			-	-			-	-
19				-	-			-	-			-	-
20				-	-			-	-			-	-
21				-	-			-	-			-	-
22				-	-			-	-			-	-
23				-	-			-	-			-	-
24				-	-			-	-			-	-

**RBS DAYS OF CARE SCHEDULE**  
**County Annual Report -- Section A, Question 2**  
**(Revised June 2012)**

COUNTY OF Sacramento

List the youth who have been admitted to your RBS program since implementation and show how they have moved through the various stages of your program thus far (e.g. from the residential group care component, to "bridge" foster care, to reunification or another form of permanency).

**Non-Profit Corp. Name:** Martins' Achievement Place, Inc.      **Program Number:** 0176.10.01      **Contact Person:** Geri Wilson  
**Period Covered:** Activity through..... 12/31/2012      **Telephone Number:** (916) 337-7222      **Date Completed:** 1/31/2013

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S
Youth Enrolled		RBS Residential Group Care				RBS Community-Based "Bridge" Foster Care						RBS Aftercare in Permanent Placement, including Reunification				CURRENT STATUS		
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Group Care, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In "Bridge" Foster Care, Total Days To Date	Number of RBS "Bridge" Foster Care Placements To Date	Did Child Incur Episodes For Crisis Stabilization?	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Aftercare or a Permanent Care Total Days To Date	Use Current Status Codes Below	For CLOSED Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	For OPEN Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	
1		9/16/2010	6/5/2011	262	-	6/5/2011	7/1/2011	26	-	no	7/1/2011	1/19/2012	202	-	4	490	-	
2		9/16/2010	12/21/2011	461	-			-	-	yes	12/21/2011	10/30/2012	314	-	4	775	-	
3		11/1/2010		-	791			-	-	yes			-	-	1		791	
4		11/5/2010	2/22/2012	474	-			-	-	yes	2/22/2012	6/12/2012	111	-	6	585	-	
5		1/6/2011	10/11/2011	278	-			-	-	no	10/11/2011	11/5/2012	391	-	4	662	-	
6		2/7/2011	10/3/2011	238	-			-	-	no	10/3/2011	6/18/2012	259	-	4	497	-	
7		6/30/2011	10/10/2012	468	-			-	-	no	10/10/2012		-	82	3		550	
8		12/21/2011	7/30/2012	222	-			-	-	no			-	-	5	222		
9		4/1/2012	8/14/2012	135	-			-	-	no	8/14/2012		-	139	1	-	274	
10		8/2/2012	12/7/2012	127	-			-	-	no			-	-	6	127	-	
11				-	-			-	-				-	-		-	-	
12				-	-			-	-				-	-		-	-	
13				-	-			-	-				-	-		-	-	
14				-	-			-	-				-	-		-	-	
15				-	-			-	-				-	-		-	-	
16				-	-			-	-				-	-		-	-	
17				-	-			-	-				-	-		-	-	
18				-	-			-	-				-	-		-	-	
19				-	-			-	-				-	-		-	-	
20				-	-			-	-				-	-		-	-	
21				-	-			-	-				-	-		-	-	
22				-	-			-	-				-	-		-	-	
23				-	-			-	-				-	-		-	-	
24				-	-			-	-				-	-		-	-	

**Current Status Codes:**

- 1 RBS Case Open with Youth in Residential Group Care
- 2 RBS Case Open with Youth in "Bridge" Foster Care
- 3 RBS Case Open with Youth in Permanent Placement with RBS Aftercase Services
- 4 RBS Case Closed: Graduation
- 5 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation due to Emancipation
- 6 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation for Reason other than Emancipation
- 7 RBS Case Closed: Voluntary Closure
- 8 RBS Case Closed: AB 3632 Eligibility Ends

**RBS DAYS OF CARE SCHEDULE FOR CRISIS STABILIZATION**  
**County Annual Report -- Section A, Question 2**  
**(Revised June 2012)**

COUNTY OF Sacramento

List the youth who have had a Crisis Stabilization episode during the report period and show the number of days in each placement per episode. (The total number of days a client spends in Crisis Stabilization runs concurrently and is included in the total number of days in the Community component the youth was in when the Crisis Stabilization episode

**Non-Profit Corp. Name:** Martin's Achievement Place, Inc.      **Program Number:** 0176.10.01      **Contact Person:** Geri Wilson  
**Period Covered:** Activity through..... 12/31/2012      **Telephone Number:** (916) 337-7222      **Date Completed:** 1/14/2013

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
Youth Enrolled		#1 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#2 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#3 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT			
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission		Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date
1		5/9/2012	5/16/2012	7	-			-	-			-	-
2		6/12/2012	7/12/2012	30	-			-	-			-	-
3				-	-			-	-			-	-
4				-	-			-	-			-	-
5				-	-			-	-			-	-
6				-	-			-	-			-	-
7				-	-			-	-			-	-
8				-	-			-	-			-	-
9				-	-			-	-			-	-
10				-	-			-	-			-	-
11				-	-			-	-			-	-
12				-	-			-	-			-	-
13				-	-			-	-			-	-
14				-	-			-	-			-	-
15				-	-			-	-			-	-
16				-	-			-	-			-	-
17				-	-			-	-			-	-
18				-	-			-	-			-	-
19				-	-			-	-			-	-
20				-	-			-	-			-	-
21				-	-			-	-			-	-
22				-	-			-	-			-	-
23				-	-			-	-			-	-
24				-	-			-	-			-	-

**RBS DAYS OF CARE SCHEDULE**  
**County Annual Report -- Section A, Question 2**  
**(Revised June 2012)**

COUNTY OF Sacramento

List the youth who have been admitted to your RBS program since implementation and show how they have moved through the various stages of your program thus far (e.g. from the residential group care component, to "bridge" foster care, to reunification or another form of permanency).

**Non-Profit Corp. Name:** Quality Group Homes, Inc.      **Program Number:** 0351.10.01      **Contact Person:** Geri Wilson  
**Period Covered:** Activity through..... 12/31/2012      **Telephone Number:** (916) 933-4156      **Date Completed:** 1/14/2013

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S
Youth Enrolled		RBS Residential Group Care				RBS Community-Based "Bridge" Foster Care					RBS Aftercare in Permanent Placement, including Reunification				CURRENT STATUS			
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Group Care, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In "Bridge" Foster Care, Total Days To Date	Number of RBS "Bridge" Foster Care Placements To Date	Did Child Incur Episodes For Crisis Stabilization?	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Aftercare or a Permanent Care Total Days To Date	Use Current Status Codes Below	For CLOSED Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	For OPEN Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	
1		10/1/2010	5/2/2011	213	-		-	-		no	5/2/2011	10/19/2011	170	-	6	383	-	
2		10/15/2010	10/31/2011	381	-		-	-		no	10/31/2011	11/5/2012	371	-	4	752	-	
3		11/17/2010	7/5/2011	230	-		-	-		no	7/5/2011	12/31/2011	179	-	6	409	-	
4		12/28/2010	7/5/2011	189	-		-	-		no	7/5/2011	7/3/2012	364	-	4	553	-	
5		2/16/2011	9/26/2011	222	-		-	-		no	9/26/2011	6/15/2012	263	-	4	485	-	
6		4/30/2011		-	611		-	-		no			-	-	1	-	611	
7		7/21/2011		-	529		-	-		no			-	-	1	-	529	
8		7/29/2011	8/27/2012	395	-		-	-		no	8/27/2012	11/26/2012	91	-	4	486	-	
9		11/7/2010	12/9/2010	32	-		-	-		no			-	-	6	32	-	
10		10/4/2011	12/20/2012	443	-		-	-		no			-	-	6	443	-	
11		11/29/2011	2/29/2012	92	-		-	-		no			-	-	6	92	-	
12		1/25/2012		-	341		-	-		no			-	-	1	-	341	
13		4/25/2012	8/16/2012	113	-		-	-		no			-	-	6	113	-	
14		11/15/2012		-	46		-	-		no			-	-	1	-	46	
15		11/15/2012		-	46		-	-		no			-	-	1	-	46	
16		12/13/2012		-	18		-	-		no			-	-	1	-	18	
17				-	-		-	-					-	-		-	-	
18				-	-		-	-					-	-		-	-	
19				-	-		-	-					-	-		-	-	
20				-	-		-	-					-	-		-	-	
21				-	-		-	-					-	-		-	-	
22				-	-		-	-					-	-		-	-	
23				-	-		-	-					-	-		-	-	
24				-	-		-	-					-	-		-	-	

**Current Status Codes:**

- 1 RBS Case Open with Youth in Residential Group Care
- 2 RBS Case Open with Youth in "Bridge" Foster Care
- 3 RBS Case Open with Youth in Permanent Placement with RBS Aftercase Services
- 4 RBS Case Closed: Graduation
- 5 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation due to Emancipation
- 6 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation for Reason other than Emancipation
- 7 RBS Case Closed: Voluntary Closure
- 8 RBS Case Closed: AB 3632 Eligibility Ends

**RBS DAYS OF CARE SCHEDULE FOR CRISIS STABILIZATION**  
**County Annual Report -- Section A, Question 2**  
**(Revised June 2012)**

COUNTY OF Sacramento

List the youth who have had a Crisis Stabilization episode during the report period and show the number of days in each placement per episode. (The total number of days a client spends in Crisis Stabilization runs concurrently and is included in the total number of days in the Community component the youth was in when the Crisis Stabilization episode

**Non-Profit Corp. Name:** Quality Group Homes, Inc.

**Program Number:** 0351.10.01

**Contact Person:** Gerri Wilson

**Period Covered:** Activity through..... 12/31/2012

**Telephone Number:** (916) 337-7222

**Date Completed:** 1/14/2013

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
Youth Enrolled		#1 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#2 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#3 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT			
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission		Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date
1				-	-			-	-			-	-
2				-	-			-	-			-	-
3				-	-			-	-			-	-
4				-	-			-	-			-	-
5				-	-			-	-			-	-
6				-	-			-	-			-	-
7				-	-			-	-			-	-
8				-	-			-	-			-	-
9				-	-			-	-			-	-
10				-	-			-	-			-	-
11				-	-			-	-			-	-
12				-	-			-	-			-	-
13				-	-			-	-			-	-
14				-	-			-	-			-	-
15				-	-			-	-			-	-
16				-	-			-	-			-	-
17				-	-			-	-			-	-
18				-	-			-	-			-	-
19				-	-			-	-			-	-
20				-	-			-	-			-	-
21				-	-			-	-			-	-
22				-	-			-	-			-	-
23				-	-			-	-			-	-
24				-	-			-	-			-	-