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GIS: SchoolMinder

• Implemented July 1, 2006 to support:
  – Educational Continuity
    • Identifies foster parents in the same school catchment (Chicago) or school district (rest of state), or
    • Identifies the nearest homes to the child’s school, or
    • Identifies the nearest homes to the home of the natural parent from which they were removed if school is unknown
  – Family ties
    • Homes chosen by above rules further reunification and other goals because proximity to natural parents promotes:
      – Supervised parental visitation
      – Supervised sibling visitation, etc.
Summary: GIS Placement Distances and Resource Development

- Up to 75% closer placement w/in county geographies when resources are constant
- System experienced a 43.6% reduction in ‘available’ foster care resources over 5 years
- Median and average placement distances are 37% less with GIS than were non-GIS with 77.2% more resources!
  - I can give you 77.2% more resources and still provide more access via GIS
- ‘High Need’ Areas
  - 10% of foster care resources, 30% of intake
    - GIS-directed placements result in ‘donut’ (Rockford)
    - GIS-directed recruiting prevents further resource loss and new resources are better located
  - Rockford
    - ‘Worse case’ intake distribution improved by 28.6% in one year
  - Decatur
    - ‘Worse case’ intake distribution improved by 31.4% in one year
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GIS – Meeting the Challenge

- High Need Homes more likely used
- 2008 – GIS based recruiting began
  - % of homes serving High Need areas stabilizes
  - % of new homes serving High Need areas jumps by 42.8% to 49.6%
  - Close to stabilizing resource loss, even without major new campaigns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>July</th>
<th>Homes In HighNeed Areas</th>
<th>Total Homes</th>
<th>% HighNeed Homes</th>
<th>% New HighNeed Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GIS – Meeting The Challenge

• ‘High Need’ areas – 30% the intake, 10% the resources

• More traditional intake in 2010 than available beds at beginning of year, successfully replacing resources through focused recruiting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All High Need Areas</th>
<th>All Intake 2010</th>
<th>Traditional Intake Only 2010</th>
<th>Traditional Beds Ending 2009</th>
<th>Traditional Beds Ending 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GIS and Resources in High Need Areas
(Creating and Filling the ‘Donut’)

Year 1, Resource Rich

Year 2, Resources Used Up in Areas of High Intake

Year 3, Donut Expands, Problem Identified

Year 5, Inroads Made on The ‘Donut’

Homes are blue pentagons, red dots are intake
For calendar year 2010. Pink is ‘High Need’ area.
## SchoolMinder vs. Traditional Placement Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SchoolMinder (N=1309)</th>
<th>Traditional (n=1995)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage placed within a five-minute drive of initial home*</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement within School District (state excluding city)*</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Closure by 7/09</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Days Until Case Closure among Closed Cases</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Adoption</td>
<td>19% (of closed cases)</td>
<td>15% (of closed cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Reunification</td>
<td>72% (of closed cases)</td>
<td>80% (of closed cases)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant p<.001