



MHSOAC Statewide Full Service Partnership (FSP) Outcomes Report

Deliverable 18.1 of MHSOAC Contract 10-702000-000

Report Developed by University Enterprises, Inc. and Mental Health Data Alliance, LLC

6/30/2014

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
Introduction.....	7
California Mental Health Regions.....	10
Data Quality.....	11
1. Partners Served.....	13
2. Discharged Partners.....	19
3. Homelessness or Emergency Shelter (Discharged).....	23
4. Primary Care Physician (Discharged).....	25
5. Partners Admitted and Retained.....	29
6. Education (1 Year).....	37
7. Employment (1 Year).....	39
8. Arrests (1 Year).....	41
9. Incarcerations (1 Year).....	45
10. Emergencies (1 Year).....	49
11. Hospitalizations (1 Year).....	53
Appendices: Supporting Data Tables.....	57

Executive Summary

Purpose

The Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission (MHSOAC) is responsible for providing oversight of the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) and its components. This report presents descriptive outcomes for partners served through the MHSA Full Service Partnership (FSP) program in fiscal years 2010/2011 (FY11) and 2011/2012 (FY12). The data evaluated in this report was extracted in May of 2013 from the Data Collection and Reporting (DCR) repository maintained by California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS). This report provides outcomes of FSP programs across age groups, counties, regions and the state.

There are seven counties which had not reported FSP program data to the DCR at the time of the data extraction: Alameda, Alpine, Marin, Mendocino, Monterey, Riverside, and Santa Barbara. Since the time of the data extraction in 2013, many of these counties have actively attempted to become or became certified by DHCS to batch report historic and ongoing data to the DCR, as detailed in the following list.

- Alameda County has been certified and has submitted all of the current data and historical data to the FSP DCR.
- Alpine County recently entered all of their historical and current FSP data in the FSP DCR system and are currently up to date on data submissions.
- Marin County was certified by DHCS in late April 2014 to upload all FSP data to the production environment. All historical data has since been uploaded and Marin is submitting FSP data as required.
- Mendocino County is currently working with DHCS on testing submissions to become certified to submit via electronic batch submission. Mendocino County has currently passed three of the seven tests. Once Mendocino county passes all seven tests, the historical data will be submitted quickly.
- Monterey County has entered the data in their Electronic Medical Record (EMR) system and have had difficulty transmitting files to the State. Monterey is attempting to work closely with their vendor to address this issue.
- Riverside County has developed and utilized internal FSP data reports to inform management on performance outcomes. Electronic submission of data to the FSP DCR system resumed once the State system was able to accept the electronic batch files.
- Santa Barbara County has submitted data but is not caught up with submitting everything up to date. The county intends to be completely caught up sometime in the second week of July 2014.

All values in this report are based on the 52 counties which had data in the FSP DCR at the time of the data extraction.

Study Population and Selection Criteria

When representing outcomes for partners served in FSP Programs within a fiscal year (FY), it is helpful to imagine three distinct populations, and those include: 1) Partners who were served less than 1 year; 2) Partners who were admitted in the previous fiscal year and retained for a full year, reaching their 1 year anniversary date within the program during the fiscal year; and 3) Partners who reached one year of service in a previous fiscal year. Those partners who are discharged in a given fiscal year comprise a combination of these three subgroups.

Executive Summary

Some FSP outcomes can be evaluated as a comparison of status at the beginning of partnership (upon enrollment) and at discharge. However, many other FSP outcomes are best evaluated for full years of a partnership, and this is because the comparison baseline data is collected in aggregate for the entire previous year for each partner.

Outcomes for subgroups of partners are represented in different sections of this report including those who were actively served in a fiscal year (Section 1), those who were discharged in a fiscal year (Sections 2-4), those who were admitted in a fiscal year (Section 5), and partners who reached 1 year of service in a fiscal year (Section 6-11).

Key Points

1. In FY11, 33,328 and in FY12, 35,110 partners were actively being served in FSP programs statewide
2. This report provides outcomes for 8,921 partners who were discharged in FY11 and 8,488 in FY12
3. This report provides outcomes for 9,263 partners reaching one year of service in FY11 and 6,513 in FY12

Characteristics of Partners Served in FY11 and FY12:

4. Of the 8,205 Child partners served in FY11 and the 8,968 served in FY12, the most common issues noted upon partner enrollment were related to academic grades (between 48% and 49% for both FY), school attendance (between 40% and 42% for both FY) and special education (30% for both FY)
5. Of the 25,123 TAY, Adult and Older Adult partners served in FY11 and the 26,142 served in FY12, the most common issues noted upon partner enrollment were related to substance abuse (52%) and mental health or substance abuse related emergency events (40-41%)
6. Counties target and serve heterogeneous populations of partners, which may have an assortment of needs requiring a variety of program intensities

Outcomes for Partners Discharged in FY11 and FY12:

Outcome - Discharged for Having Met Goals

7. Approximately half of Child partners, one quarter of TAY and Adult partners, and nearly one third of Older Adult partners were discharged for having met their goals within the FSP program for both FY11 and FY12
8. Seven counties (Kings, Los Angeles, Merced, Orange, San Mateo, Santa Cruz and Stanislaus) discharged over half of their partners for the reason of having “met goals” in both FY11 and FY12

Outcome – Residential Setting of Homeless or Emergency Shelter

9. A majority of partners discharged in FY11 (51.1%) and FY12 (50.1%) statewide who began a partnership with a residential status of homeless or in an emergency shelter were no longer homeless or in an emergency shelter upon discharge (and were not incarcerated)
10. In the Central region, 62.8% of partners discharged in FY11 and 63.4% of partners discharged in FY12 were no longer homeless or in an emergency shelter (and were not incarcerated)
11. Older Adults had the greatest success rates (71.2% in FY11 and 61.5% in FY12) in moving from a residential status of homeless or emergency shelter to an improved residential status at discharge

Executive Summary

Outcome – Primary Care Physician

12. Statewide, 77.2% of partners discharged in FY11 and 79.2% of partners discharged in FY12 had a primary care physician, which was an approximate 10% increase in partners with a primary care physician from the time of admission
13. In the Central region, 81.5% partners discharged in FY11 and 84.3% of partners discharged in FY12 had a primary care physician, which was an approximate 13-14% increase in partners with a primary care physician from the time of admission
14. For both years FY11 and FY12, over 90% of Child and Older Adult partners discharged statewide had a primary care physician, which was an approximate 5% increase for Child partners and an approximate 13% increase for Older Adult partners as compared to the beginning of the partnership
15. Fresno County experienced more than a 15% increase in partners with a primary care physician from the beginning of partnership to discharge for both FY11 (28.8%) and FY12 (20.0%)

Length of Retention for Partners Admitted in FY10 and FY11:

16. The proportion of partners admitted who were retained for one full year varies by age group
17. Statewide, 70-75% of Adults and Older Adult partners admitted in FY10 or FY11 were retained for at least one full year or more of service, while only 50-55% of Child and TAY partners admitted in FY10 or FY11 were retained in service for one year or more
18. Statewide, 70-75% of Child and TAY partners admitted in FY10 or FY11 were retained for six months or longer
19. One third of Child partners who were discharged before six months had met their goals in the program, however less than 15% of TAY partners served for less than six months who were discharged in FY11 and FY12 had met their goals in the program
20. Eight counties (Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, San Mateo, Stanislaus and Sutter-Yuba) retained 75% of Child and TAY partners for six months or longer for both FY10 and FY11
21. Fourteen counties (Amador, Butte, El Dorado, Fresno, Humboldt, Nevada, Placer, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San Joaquin, Sutter-Yuba and Ventura) retained greater than 85% of Adult and Older Adult partners for one year or more of those admitted in years FY10 and FY11

Outcomes for Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY11 and FY12:

Outcome – Child Education

22. More Child partners had attendance always or most of the time at one year of FSP service as compared to the beginning of the partnership in most regions and statewide
23. Only approximately 22% of Child partners finishing their first year of partnership in FY11 and FY12 statewide began the partnership with good or very good grades
24. Statewide, nearly half of Child partners finishing their first year of partnership in FY11 and FY12 had good, very good or improved grades

Outcome – Employment for Partners with Employment Goals

25. Statewide, 7-10% of partners with employment goals had any kind of employment at the beginning of partnership

Executive Summary

26. During the first year of partnership, 10-11% of partners with employment goals began any kind of new employment, with those proportions being highest in the Bay Area and Southern regions, where 15% to 18% began new employment during the partnership

Outcome – Arrests

27. Statewide, 21.7% of partners reaching 1 year of service in FY11 and 23.7% of partners reaching 1 year of service in FY12 reported one arrest or more in the year before entering partnership; during the first year of partnership, only 4.1% in FY11 and 4.6% in FY12 reported having one or more arrests during the partnership
28. The Bay Area region served the greatest proportion of partners who reported arrests in the year before partnership (37.7% in FY11 and 31.9% in FY12); during the first year of partnership only 6.2% of those partners reported having one or more arrests for FY11 and FY12 cohorts
29. Statewide, as compared to other age groups, a larger proportion of TAY (30.4% of TAY reaching 1 year of service in FY11 and 27.7% of TAY reaching one year of service in FY12) reported having one or more arrests in the year before partnership, and this number was reduced to 5.1% and 8.0% during the first year of partnership in FY11 and FY12, respectively
30. Eleven counties (El Dorado, Fresno, Imperial, Kern, Los Angeles, Madera, Orange, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara and Tulare) experienced over a 15% reduction or a complete reduction in partners with arrests from the year before to the first year of partnership in both FY11 and FY12

Outcome – Incarcerations

31. Statewide, 18.1% of partners for FY11 and 20.1% for FY12 reported having an incarceration in the year before entering partnership; during the first year of partnership, 12.1% in FY11 and 13.6% in FY12 reported a residential setting or a discharge reason which related to incarceration
32. The Bay Area region served the greatest proportion of partners who had incarcerations in the year before partnership (36.1% in FY11 and 32.0% in FY12); in their first year of partnership, a reduced proportion of 23.3% in FY11 and 21.1% in FY12 reported having a residential setting or a discharge reason which related to incarceration
33. Statewide, as compared to other age groups, a larger proportion of TAY served (24.5% of TAY for FY11 and 23.5% of TAY for FY12) reported incarceration in the year before partnership, and this number was reduced to 18.1% and 19.4% during the first year of partnership in FY11 and FY12, respectively
34. Kern, San Luis Obispo and Santa Clara counties experienced over 10% reduction in incarceration from the year before to the first year of partnership for partners served in both FY11 and FY12

Outcome – Mental Health or Substance Abuse Related Emergencies

35. Statewide, there were 25% to 30% fewer partners with a mental health or substance abuse related emergency in the first year of partnership as compared to the year before partnership for both fiscal years evaluated (reduced from 34.8% to 9.9% in FY11 and from 38.1% to 8.1% in FY12)
36. As compared to other age groups, a larger proportion of TAY (41.9% in FY11 and 45.0% in FY12) and Adult (40.9% in FY11 and 46.8% in FY12) partners who were served reported mental health or substance abuse related emergencies in the year before partnership, and this number was reduced to 10-11% for TAY and 9-13% for Adult partners during the first year of partnership in FY11 and FY12

Executive Summary

37. Fourteen counties (El Dorado, Fresno, Kern, Madera, Napa, San Francisco, San Joaquin, Santa Clara, Shasta, Siskiyou, Solano, Stanislaus, Yolo and Sutter-Yuba) experienced over a 25% reduction or a complete reduction in partners with mental health or substance abuse related emergencies from the year before to the first year of partnership in both FY11 and FY12.

Outcome – Non-State Psychiatric Hospitalizations

38. Between 20-30% of partners had a non-state psychiatric hospitalization in the year before partnership within all regions for both fiscal years, and every region reported a decrease in non-state psychiatric hospitalization in the first year of service as compared to the year before, reflecting a decrease of approximately 5-15% for all regions
39. Statewide, approximately one quarter to one third of TAY, Adult and Older Adult partners reported having a non-state psychiatric hospitalization in the year before partnership, and this proportions was reduced to approximately one fifth or less for TAY, Adult and Older Adult partners during the first year of partnership in FY11 and FY12
40. Four counties (Fresno, Kern, Stanislaus and Yolo) experienced over a 10% reduction in non-state psychiatric hospitalizations for partners from the year before to the first year during partnership for both FY11 and FY12

Introduction

This report presents descriptive outcomes for partners served through the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) Full Service Partnership (FSP) program in fiscal years 2010/2011 (FY11) and 2011/2012 (FY12). The data evaluated in this report was extracted in May of 2013 from the Data Collection and Reporting (DCR) repository maintained by the California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS). This report provides outcomes of FSP programs across age groups, counties, regions and the state.

The 59 County Mental Health Plans (MHPs, including 56 counties + Sutter-Yuba combined counties + Berkeley City region + Tri-City region, hereafter referred to as “counties”) receive state-based funding for mental health services as a result of California Proposition 63 (now known as the Mental Health Services Act or MHSA), passed in November of 2004. MHSA provides increased funding to support California’s county mental health programs, and MHSA funds a special program called the Full Service Partnership (FSP). FSP programs provide a full spectrum of mental health services to children/youth (Child, ages 0 – 15) and transition age youth (TAY, ages 16 – 25) who are seriously emotionally disturbed and adults (Adult, ages 26 – 59) and older adults (Older Adult, ages 60+) who have a serious mental disorder. All those served are referred to as partners in the program. Additional criteria, described in Welfare and Institution Code (WIC) §5600.3, must also be met. A basic principle of the program is its flexible funding, which assures that counties may provide whatever services are necessary to help the individual access needed resources. Services offered by local programs include assessing the individual’s needs; providing shelter/housing; establishing identification and legal assistance needs; and providing food, clothing, showers, medical, psychiatric, dental care, alcohol/drug treatment, and social rehabilitation.

Partners enrolled in the FSP provide information at intake through a partnership assessment form (PAF), which includes information about the partner’s current status, the status in the 12 months before enrollment, and the status prior to the last 12 months. Information is collected in the following domains: Residential Housing, Employment, Education, Financial Support, Health Status, Emergency Intervention, Substance Abuse, Legal Issues, and for older adults only, Activities of Daily Living (ADL) and Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL). Partners served provide regular updates to their status and progress within the program through quarterly assessments (3M) and via key event tracking (KET).

The Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission (MHSOAC) is responsible for providing oversight of the MHSA and its components, as well as the broader community mental health system in California. Within this role, the MHSOAC ensures accountability to taxpayers and the public. As one of its oversight approaches, the MHSOAC has adopted a commitment to pursuing meaningful evaluation of the MHSA and greater community mental health system.

The ability to successfully use evaluation methods to provide oversight and hold responsible entities accountable for their roles within the MHSA is dependent upon access to valid data that is reliably reported and made available to the MHSOAC on a regular basis. Outcomes from the MHSA FSP are reported to the DCR system, and since August 2011, the MHSOAC has sponsored efforts to improve the quality of the FSP data. This report presents descriptive outcomes for partners served by FSP programs, and the reliability of the outcomes in this report depends on the quality of the FSP data. Prior MHSOAC sponsored reports provided information on the completeness of the FSP assessment data, and all outcomes presented in this report should be interpreted while considering the underlying data quality. To this end, a section detailing statewide data quality is presented on page 11, and supplementary tables in the Appendix of this report describe the completeness of supportive data elements, wherever possible.

Introduction

Through a comparison of two years of the most recent available data (FY11 and FY12), this report is intended to describe basic proportions of partners served who experience targeted changes within the FSP program.

There are seven counties which had not reported FSP program data to the DCR at the time of the data extraction: Alameda, Alpine, Marin, Mendocino, Monterey, Riverside, and Santa Barbara. Since the time of the data extraction in 2013, many of these counties have actively attempted to become or became certified by DHCS to batch report historic and ongoing data to the DCR, as detailed in the following list.

- Alameda County has been certified and has submitted all of the current data and historical data to the FSP DCR.
- Alpine County recently entered all of their historical and current FSP data in the FSP DCR system and are currently up to date on data submissions.
- Marin County was certified by DHCS in late April 2014 to upload all FSP data to the production environment. All historical data has since been uploaded and Marin is submitting FSP data as required.
- Mendocino County is currently working with DHCS on testing submissions to become certified to submit via electronic batch submission. Mendocino County has currently passed three of the seven tests. Once Mendocino county passes all seven tests, the historical data will be submitted quickly.
- Monterey County has entered the data in their Electronic Medical Record (EMR) system and have had difficulty transmitting files to the State. Monterey is attempting to work closely with their vendor to address this issue.
- Riverside County has developed and utilized internal FSP data reports to inform management on performance outcomes. Electronic submission of data to the FSP DCR system resumed once the State system was able to accept the electronic batch files.
- Santa Barbara County has submitted data, but is not caught up with submitting everything up to date. The county intends to be completely caught up sometime in the second week of July 2014.

All values in this report are based on the 52 counties which had data in the FSP DCR at the time of the data extraction.

This report is organized into 11 sections of choropleth maps, tables, charts and graphs representing outcomes for subgroups of partners in different sections, including all partners actively served in a fiscal year (Section 1), those who were discharged in a fiscal year (Sections 2 - 4), those who were admitted in a fiscal year (Section 5), and partners who reached 1 year of service in a fiscal year (Section 6 - 11).

California is organized into five mental health regions (Superior, Central, Bay Area, Southern, and Los Angeles). As illustrated on the following page, The California Mental Health Regions map associates each county to its region and its DCR county identifier. Throughout the data sections of the report, county numbers are displayed in maps, and the regional map on the following page serves as a key for the report to identify county names and county regions. For some counties, the number of partners which met the criteria for a section may have been small. When percentages were calculated by county, counties with less than 10 partners in the denominator may have been excluded from calculations due to small


Introduction

numbers (SN). In some cases, while the values are censored, outcomes for counties with small numbers are summarized as increases (IC), decreases (DC), no change (NC) or none served (NS, meaning no partners with the targeted issue were served). When issues are addressed and eliminated for all partners in a county, large or small, then results may be summarized as “ALL” in the data maps. Data tables supporting all of the maps and charts are either displayed on the page with the map/chart or are included in the Appendix (for large tables). When data tables are included as an appendix table, the appendix table number (A-1 to A-24) is referenced. Also of note, the values displayed in tables are rounded to a fixed number of decimal points, and values bordering cutoff levels may appear to conflict with the legend. The true values (not the rounded values) were used to categorize outcome results.

The total number of partners evaluated in each section may vary slightly as only partners with complete information (non null values) on the assessments with information for each outcome were included for each section. For example, a partner may have an incomplete PAF assessment in which the number of arrests in the year before partnership was completed but the number of mental health or substance abuse emergencies was left blank. In this case, the partner would be included for the section evaluating arrests, but the partner would be excluded for the section evaluating mental health or substance abuse emergencies, affecting the total number of partners evaluated. The appendix tables reflect the total partners with data for each outcome.

Any county, large or small, may be excluded from an analysis due to low data quality (LQ) for the partners evaluated. The Data Quality Section represents an overview by county of data quality assessed via 3M and KET completion rates for continuous partners. Continuous partners are partners who are served consistently throughout their partnership enrollment without the submission of discharge and reestablishment assessments. Partners who are discharged may subsequently be reestablished within one year of discharge in order to continue working toward their partnership goals, and these partners are referred to as “non-continuous” partners due to the interruption of service during the partnership. Non-continuous partners made up 4.7% in FY11 and 5.1% in FY12 of all active partnerships. In non-continuous partnerships, it is expected that 3M assessment information could be missing from intervals in which the partner was inactive, and thus the Data Quality Section evaluates only continuously served partnerships.


California Mental Health Regions



01 Alameda	13 Imperial	25 Modoc	37 San Diego	49 Sonoma
02 Alpine	14 Inyo	26 Mono	38 San Francisco	50 Stanislaus
03 Amador	15 Kern	27 Monterey	39 San Joaquin	52 Tehama
04 Butte	16 Kings	28 Napa	40 San Luis Obispo	53 Trinity
05 Calaveras	17 Lake	29 Nevada	41 San Mateo	54 Tulare
06 Colusa	18 Lassen	30 Orange	42 Santa Barbara	55 Tuolumne
07 Contra Costa	19 Los Angeles	31 Placer	43 Santa Clara	56 Ventura
08 Del Norte	20 Madera	32 Plumas	44 Santa Cruz	57 Yolo
09 El Dorado	21 Marin	33 Riverside	45 Shasta	63 Sutter-Yuba
10 Fresno	22 Mariposa	34 Sacramento	46 Sierra	65 Berkeley City
11 Glenn	23 Mendocino	35 San Benito	47 Siskiyou	66 Tri-City
12 Humboldt	24 Merced	36 San Bernadino	48 Solano	

Data Quality

DQ.2 Percent of 3Ms in First Year of Partnership and Percent of Partners with KETs in Entire Partnership for Continuous Partners Served in FY11




The accurate evaluation of outcomes is dependent on the quality of assessment data collected and reported. Evaluation of outcomes which depend on key events (such as residential changes, arrests, incarcerations, emergency events and hospitalizations) are particularly susceptible to data quality issues. Key events during the partnership are tracked as the event occurs through a KET assessment form. It is impossible to accurately identify the completion rate for KETs, but partners generally experience at least one key event within a year of the partnership. A large percentage of partners without KET submissions during the partnership signals a potential problem with the process to gather and submit FSP information. Additional partnership status are updated quarterly through 3M assessments. Partners who are served continuously should have four 3M assessments in the first year.

Thus, for outcomes in this report which depend upon reported key events, a county-level data quality threshold was applied. Via this threshold, counties are excluded from analysis in sections 8-11 of this report if the threshold for data quality was not met. Part of the threshold required a 70% completion rate for 3Ms due in the first year of service for partners reaching 1 year of service in the fiscal year. The second part of the threshold required that at least 70% of partners reaching 1 year of service in the fiscal year have at least one KET submitted during their entire partnership (including discharge KETs).

Data Quality

DQ.2 Percent of 3Ms in First Year of Partnership and Percent of Partners with KETs in Entire Partnership for Continuous Partners Served in FY12




Considering only continuously served partners reaching one full year of service, the maps in DQ.1 and DQ.2 represent each county's threshold completion rates (70%) for 3Ms and KETs. The map represents which counties met or did not meet the 70% 3M criteria, the 70% KET criteria or both criteria.

In FY11, 8,287 partners reached the anniversary of their first year of service, and of those partners, 7,585 (91.5%) were served continuously throughout their partnership. As seen in DQ.1, 37 counties met the minimum threshold for data quality, two counties did not meet the threshold due to KET assessments only, seven counties did not meet the threshold due to 3M assessment rates only, and six counties did not meet threshold due to both 3M and KET completion rates.

In FY12, 6,513 partners reached the anniversary of their first year of service, and of those partners, 6,028 (92.6%) were served continuously throughout their partnership. As seen in DQ.2, 35 counties met the minimum threshold for data quality, three counties did not meet the threshold due to KET assessments rates only, seven counties did not meet the threshold due to 3M assessment rates only, and seven counties did not meet threshold due to both 3M and KET completion rates. Supporting data for DQ.1 and DQ.2 can be found in Appendix Table A-1.

1. Partners Served

1.1: Venn Diagram of Groups of Partners Served in a Fiscal Year



When representing outcomes for partners served in FSP Programs within a fiscal year, it is helpful to imagine three distinct populations, and those include: 1) Partners who were served less than 1 year; 2) Partners who were admitted in the previous fiscal year and retained for a full year, reaching their 1 year anniversary date within the program during the fiscal year; and 3) Partners who reached one year of service in a previous fiscal year. Those partners who are discharged in a given fiscal year comprise a combination of these three subgroups. These groups are visually represented in 1.1. above.


Some FSP outcomes can be evaluated as a comparison of status at the beginning of partnership (upon enrollment) and at discharge. However, many other FSP outcomes are best evaluated for full years of a partnership, and this is because the comparison baseline data is collected in aggregate for the entire previous year before partnership for each partner.

Thus, partners served less than 1 year who are not discharged are not evaluated in this report (~25% of the total FSP population served in a fiscal year) as they do not have either discharge status nor a full year of partnership data for evaluation. In addition, partners who reached one year of service in a previous fiscal year who were not discharged are not evaluated (approximately 30-35%), and this is due to the complexity of differences within the subgroup as well as the significantly declining data quality for this subgroup.

The outcomes for the two main groups of partners evaluated are represented in different sections of this report including those who were discharged in the fiscal year (Section 2-4) as well as partners who reached 1 year of service in the fiscal year (Sections 5-11). As seen in 1.1., these are not distinct groups, and a small amount of overlap (approximately 5% of total served) is represented as partners in both groups.

1. Partners Served

1.2: Partners Selected and Not Selected for this Report of Total Partners Served in Fiscal Year



Met Selection Criteria for Report	15,508	13,797
Selected as Discharged	8,921	8,488
Selected as Reaching 1 Year	8,287	6,513
Reached 1 Yr in Previous FY & Not Discharged (Not Selected)	9,263	13,075
Served < 1 Yr & Not Discharged (Not Selected)	8,557	8,238

Total Served

33,328

35,110

The graph in 1.2 represents the groups of partners *selected* and *not selected* for this report from the total partners served in FSP programs. The total number of partners served who met either of the two groups' selection criteria for the report (either discharged in the fiscal year or reached 1 year of service in the fiscal year) is displayed as the first bar in the graph for each fiscal year. Due to overlap between the two groups selected, the total selected is less than the sum of the two selection groups, which appear as the next two bars in the graph for each fiscal year. The last two (gray) bars in each graph represent distinct groups of partners who were not selected for this report. These groups include those who reached one year of service in a previous fiscal year who were not discharged in the identified fiscal year and those who were served for less than one year who were not discharged in the identified fiscal year.

This report represents outcomes for 46.5% and 39.3% of partners served in FY11 and FY12, respectively. A total of 26.8% partners served in FY11 and 24.2% of partners served in FY12 were discharged within that year. Also, 24.9% of partners served in FY11 and 18.6% of partners served in FY12 reached their first year of service within that year. Among those partners who are not evaluated within this report are 27.8% of partners served in FY11 and 37.2% of partners served in FY12 who had reached one year of service in a previous fiscal year. This group of partners represents a complex population to evaluate due to a variety of lengths within the partnership as well as declining data quality over time in the partnership, with some partners (22.7% of total served in FY11 and 25.0% of total served in FY12) becoming stagnant over time (i.e., no assessments submitted in 365 days or more) within the DCR without discharge. Thus, data quality issues are a significant concern in evaluating this subgroup. The other group not included, those served less than one year without discharge, did not have appropriate data available for evaluation.

1. Partners Served

1.3: Case Mix as Percent of Child Partners Served who Reported at Enrollment a History of Select Issues, Statewide and Region by Fiscal Year

0 to 20% >20 to 35% >35% to 100%

	FY-2010/2011																				
	Served n	Academic Grades		School Attendance		Special Education		Out of Home Residential Placement		Emergency - Mental or Substance		Legal Involvement		Inpatient Psychiatric		Substance Abuse		Emergency - Medical		Any of Listed Issues	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Statewide	8,205	4,001	48.8%	3,443	42.0%	2,478	30.2%	1,642	20.0%	1,331	16.2%	1,099	13.4%	765	9.3%	850	10.4%	769	9.4%	6,812	83.0%
Bay Area	711	352	49.5%	311	43.7%	327	46.0%	234	32.9%	169	23.8%	128	18.0%	83	11.7%	104	14.6%	57	8.0%	651	91.6%
Central	942	389	41.3%	369	39.2%	256	27.2%	172	18.3%	165	17.5%	178	18.9%	70	7.4%	123	13.1%	111	11.8%	704	74.7%
Los Angeles	3,703	1,848	49.9%	1,634	44.1%	1,022	27.6%	732	19.8%	612	16.5%	352	9.5%	443	12.0%	274	7.4%	270	7.3%	3,102	83.8%
Southern	2,535	1,281	50.5%	1,003	39.6%	778	30.7%	442	17.4%	345	13.6%	397	15.7%	157	6.2%	310	12.2%	293	11.6%	2,109	83.2%
Superior	314	131	41.7%	126	40.1%	95	30.3%	62	19.7%	40	12.7%	44	14.0%	12	3.8%	39	12.4%	38	12.1%	246	78.3%

	FY-2011/2012																				
	Served n	Academic Grades		School Attendance		Special Education		Out of Home Residential Placement		Emergency - Mental or Substance		Legal Involvement		Inpatient Psychiatric		Substance Abuse		Emergency - Medical		Any of Listed Issues	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Statewide	8,968	4,356	48.6%	3,654	40.7%	2,730	30.4%	1,840	20.5%	1,572	17.5%	1,141	12.7%	964	10.7%	874	9.7%	816	9.1%	7,483	83.4%
Bay Area	737	364	49.4%	300	40.7%	357	48.4%	255	34.6%	193	26.2%	122	16.6%	103	14.0%	97	13.2%	64	8.7%	658	89.3%
Central	955	413	43.2%	432	45.2%	306	32.0%	175	18.3%	161	16.9%	198	20.7%	71	7.4%	112	11.7%	118	12.4%	767	80.3%
Los Angeles	4,184	2,128	50.9%	1,801	43.0%	1,194	28.5%	827	19.8%	780	18.6%	372	8.9%	598	14.3%	300	7.2%	295	7.1%	3,550	84.8%
Southern	2,766	1,320	47.7%	988	35.7%	772	27.9%	520	18.8%	383	13.8%	408	14.8%	172	6.2%	331	12.0%	302	10.9%	2,249	81.3%
Superior	326	131	40.2%	133	40.8%	101	31.0%	63	19.3%	55	16.9%	41	12.6%	20	6.1%	34	10.4%	37	11.3%	259	79.4%

The tables in 1.3 represent the proportion of total Child partners served whose PAF indicated a history of one of the issues listed in the table. Definitions of issues from the PAF data can be found in Appendix Table A-2.

For example, the most common issue noted statewide was poor or below average grades, with 48.8% of children being served in FY11 and 48.5% of children being served in FY12 having noted an issue with grades upon enrollment to the FSP. School attendance was noted as an issue for 42.0% of children served in FY11 and 40.7% of children served in FY12. A little less than one third (30.2% in FY11 and 30.4% in FY12) of children being served had noted a history of special education services at the time of partnership enrollment. About one fifth (20.0% in FY11 and 20.5% in FY12) of youth being served had noted issues upon enrollment related to out of home residential placements (not including psychiatric or legal related placements, which are represented in their respective categories). Statewide, 13.4% in FY11 and 12.7% in FY12 of children actively being served had noted a history of legal involvement, including incarceration; a total of 9.3% in FY11 and 10.7% in FY12 had noted a history of inpatient psychiatric stays; approximately 9-10% in both years also noted a history of issues related to substance abuse or medical emergencies.

The column to the furthest right represents the proportion of Child partners actively being served who noted a history of issues upon enrollment related to any one or more of the categories listed in the table. Thus, these issues listed in the tables reflect some of the issues presented upon enrollment for 83.0% of Child partners served in FY11 and 83.4% of Child partners served in FY12. In other words, between 16-17% of Child partners did not report a history of any of these issues upon enrollment.

1. Partners Served

1.4: Case Mix as Percent of TAY, Adult and Older Adult Partners Served who Reported at Enrollment a History of Select Issues, Statewide and Region by Fiscal Year

0 to 25% >25 to 50% >50% to 100%

	FY-2010/2011															
	Served		Substance Abuse		Emergency - Mental or Substance		Emergency - Medical		Inpatient Psychiatric		Homeless/ Emergency Shelter		Legal Involvement		Any of Listed Issues	
n	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Statewide	25,123	13,234	52.7%	10,086	40.1%	5,616	22.4%	7,058	28.1%	7,750	30.8%	8,228	32.8%	20,885	83.1%	
Bay Area	2,617	1,796	68.6%	1,238	47.3%	634	24.2%	744	28.4%	841	32.1%	1,154	44.1%	2,385	91.1%	
Central	5,273	2,711	51.4%	2,328	44.1%	1,542	29.2%	1,626	30.8%	1,150	21.8%	1,520	28.8%	4,293	81.4%	
Los Angeles	7,009	3,340	47.7%	2,508	35.8%	896	12.8%	2,015	28.7%	2,899	41.4%	2,182	31.1%	5,953	84.9%	
Southern	9,029	4,766	52.8%	3,491	38.7%	2,188	24.2%	2,339	25.9%	2,581	28.6%	3,067	34.0%	7,304	80.9%	
Superior	1,195	621	52.0%	521	43.6%	356	29.8%	334	27.9%	279	23.3%	305	25.5%	950	79.5%	

	FY-2011/2012															
	Served		Substance Abuse		Emergency - Mental or Substance		Emergency - Medical		Inpatient Psychiatric		Homeless/ Emergency Shelter		Legal Involvement		Any of Listed Issues	
n	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Statewide	26,142	13,634	52.2%	10,826	41.4%	5,837	22.3%	7,582	29.0%	8,120	31.1%	8,546	32.7%	21,797	83.4%	
Bay Area	2,719	1,867	68.7%	1,293	47.6%	641	23.6%	769	28.3%	882	32.4%	1,187	43.7%	2,451	90.1%	
Central	5,564	2,820	50.7%	2,507	45.1%	1,644	29.5%	1,779	32.0%	1,192	21.4%	1,576	28.3%	4,523	81.3%	
Los Angeles	7,463	3,505	47.0%	2,773	37.2%	933	12.5%	2,196	29.4%	3,072	41.2%	2,349	31.5%	6,361	85.2%	
Southern	8,986	4,701	52.3%	3,639	40.5%	2,202	24.5%	2,460	27.4%	2,687	29.9%	3,104	34.5%	7,342	81.7%	
Superior	1,410	741	52.6%	614	43.5%	417	29.6%	378	26.8%	287	20.4%	330	23.4%	1,120	79.4%	

The tables in 1.4 represent the proportion of TAY, Adult and Older Adult partners served whose PAF indicated a history of an issue. Definitions of issues from the PAF data can be found in Appendix Table A-2.

For example, the most common issue noted statewide was co-occurring substance abuse, with 52.7% of partners being served in FY11 and 52.2% of partners being served in FY12 having noted an issue with co-occurring substance abuse upon enrollment into the FSP program. Mental health or substance related emergency events was noted as an issue for 40.1% of partners in FY11 and 41.4% of partners in FY12 who were actively being served. A little less than one quarter (22.4% in FY11 and 22.3% in FY12) of partners being served had noted history of medical emergencies in the past year at the time of partnership enrollment. Statewide, approximately one third of partners actively being served had noted a history of legal involvement, including incarceration; a total of 28.1% in FY11 and 29.0% in FY12 had noted a history of inpatient psychiatric stays; approximately 31% in both years also noted a history of homelessness or use of emergency shelters.

The column to the furthest right represents the proportion of partners actively being served who noted a history of issues upon enrollment related to any one or more of the categories listed in the table. Thus, these issues reflect some of the issues presented upon enrollment for 83.1% of partners served in FY11 and 83.4% of partners served in FY12.

1. Partners Served

1.5: Case Mix as Percent of TAY, Adult and Older Adult Partners Served who Reported at Enrollment a History of Select Issues, by County for FY11

Key:

L	0 to 25%
M	>25% to 50%
H	> 50%

Table 1.5 represents the county-level proportion of TAY, Adult or Older Adult partners actively being served in FY11 who upon enrollment noted a history of an issue listed. Categories have been grouped into Low (L, 0-25%), Medium (M, >25 to 50%), and High (H, >50%) proportions of partners with a history of an issue. Actual underlying counts cannot be displayed due to the protection of small numbers.

This table represents the heterogeneous nature of FSP programs across counties. For example, in FY11 over 50% of the partners served by Mono County had a history of legal involvement and/or substance abuse, whereas over 50% of partners served by Tuolumne County had a history of substance abuse and/or events related to mental health, substance abuse and/or medical emergencies.

	FY-2010/2011							
	Served	Substance Abuse	Emergency - Mental or Substance	Emergency - Medical	Inpatient Psychiatric	Homeless/ Emergency Shelter	Legal Involvement	% with Any of Listed Issues
Santa Cruz	105	H	H	H	H	L	L	95.2%
Tuolumne	20	H	H	H	M	M	M	90.0%
Trinity	18	H	H	H	L	H	M	94.4%
Humboldt	152	H	H	M	H	L	M	87.5%
Berkeley City	32	H	H	M	H	L	L	93.8%
Shasta	103	H	H	M	M	M	M	85.4%
Kern	608	H	H	M	M	M	M	90.5%
Fresno	702	H	H	M	M	M	M	92.5%
Stanislaus	372	H	H	M	M	M	M	94.4%
Calaveras	20	H	H	M	M	L	H	100.0%
Sutter/Yuba	91	H	H	M	M	L	M	92.3%
Napa	79	H	H	M	L	M	M	87.3%
Del Norte	23	H	H	M	L	L	L	100.0%
Placer	143	H	H	L	H	M	M	93.0%
San Luis Obispo	136	H	M	M	M	M	H	85.3%
San Francisco	693	H	M	M	M	M	M	94.2%
Sonoma	388	H	M	M	M	M	M	94.6%
Glenn	95	H	M	M	M	L	M	82.1%
El Dorado	65	H	M	M	M	L	M	83.1%
Orange	1596	H	M	M	L	H	M	88.6%
Amador	49	H	M	M	L	H	M	93.9%
Inyo	33	H	M	M	L	L	M	72.7%
San Bernardino	1950	H	M	M	L	L	M	81.8%
Sierra	11	H	M	M	L	L	M	100.0%
Santa Clara	681	H	M	L	M	M	H	90.6%
San Diego	2852	H	M	L	M	M	M	79.8%
Nevada	182	H	M	L	M	L	M	83.0%
Tulare	265	H	M	L	M	L	M	86.4%
Contra Costa	353	H	M	L	L	M	M	89.0%
Solano	144	H	M	L	L	L	H	84.0%
Kings	80	H	M	L	L	L	L	80.0%
Mono	12	H	L	M	L	L	L	58.3%
Imperial	399	H	L	L	L	L	M	87.2%
Lake	98	M	H	M	M	M	L	80.6%
Yolo	146	M	H	M	M	M	L	82.9%
Madera	115	M	H	M	M	L	M	82.6%
San Benito	34	M	H	M	M	L	M	85.3%
Merced	79	M	H	M	M	L	M	86.1%
Lassen	24	M	H	M	L	M	M	91.7%
Sacramento	1424	M	M	M	M	M	M	79.6%
Butte	291	M	M	M	M	L	L	73.2%
Tehama	40	M	M	M	L	M	L	60.0%
Modoc	45	M	M	M	L	L	M	73.3%
Mariposa	28	M	M	M	L	L	M	85.7%
San Joaquin	1629	M	M	M	L	L	L	72.0%
Los Angeles	7009	M	M	L	M	M	M	84.9%
Tri-City	129	M	M	L	M	L	M	77.5%
San Mateo	108	M	M	L	M	L	M	78.7%
Siskiyou	61	M	L	M	L	M	L	72.1%
Plumas	45	M	L	L	L	L	L	64.4%
Ventura	1359	M	L	L	L	L	L	66.4%
Colusa	SN							

1. Partners Served

1.6: Case Mix as Percent of TAY, Adult and Older Adult Partners Served who Reported at Enrollment a History of Select Issues, by County for FY12

Key:

L	0 to 25%
M	>25% to 50%
H	> 50%


Table 1.6 represents the proportion of TAY, Adult or Older Adult partners actively being served in FY12 who upon enrollment noted a history of a listed issue.

These tables allow counties with similar service needs to identify one another. For example, Kern, San Francisco and Sonoma County all serve hundreds of partners with an overall similar county service profile in that over 50% of partners served had a history of substance abuse issues and between 25 and 50% of the partners served have each of the other issues listed. This does not suggest that the needs of the populations are the same however, as underlying differences likely exist, such as factors related to urban versus rural settings. Thus, these tables further represent the heterogeneous quality of FSP programs across counties.

	FY-2011/2012							
	Served	Substance Abuse	Emergency - Mental or Substance	Emergency - Medical	Inpatient Psychiatric	Homeless/ Emergency Shelter	Legal Involvement	% with Any of Listed Issues
Calaveras	27	H	H	H	M	M	H	96.3%
Sutter/Yuba	91	H	H	H	M	L	M	89.0%
Glenn	67	H	H	H	M	L	M	89.6%
Trinity	20	H	H	H	L	H	M	95.0%
Humboldt	168	H	H	M	H	M	M	85.7%
Shasta	113	H	H	M	M	M	M	88.5%
Del Norte	18	H	H	M	M	L	L	100.0%
Amador	56	H	M	H	L	H	M	94.6%
Sierra	11	H	M	H	L	M	M	90.9%
Lassen	30	H	M	H	L	M	M	96.7%
Stanislaus	375	H	M	M	H	M	M	94.7%
Berkeley City	61	H	M	M	H	M	L	95.1%
Contra Costa	312	H	M	M	M	H	M	89.4%
Kern	723	H	M	M	M	M	M	92.4%
San Francisco	771	H	M	M	M	M	M	93.0%
Sonoma	412	H	M	M	M	M	M	94.4%
Tulare	259	H	M	M	M	L	M	84.2%
El Dorado	73	H	M	M	M	L	M	86.3%
Santa Clara	719	H	M	L	M	M	H	91.8%
Nevada	176	H	M	L	M	L	M	87.5%
Imperial	435	H	L	M	L	L	M	82.5%
Mono	11	H	L	M	L	L	L	63.6%
Santa Cruz	73	M	H	H	H	L	L	95.9%
Placer	144	M	H	M	H	M	M	93.8%
Fresno	665	M	H	M	H	M	M	94.0%
Yolo	134	M	H	M	M	M	L	80.6%
San Benito	32	M	H	M	M	L	M	90.6%
Tuolumne	40	M	M	H	M	M	M	85.0%
Merced	84	M	M	M	H	L	M	82.1%
Lake	82	M	M	M	H	L	L	78.0%
Orange	1680	M	M	M	M	H	M	88.2%
San Diego	3058	M	M	M	M	M	M	80.3%
San Bernardino	1855	M	M	M	M	M	M	81.1%
Sacramento	1481	M	M	M	M	M	M	81.6%
Napa	93	M	M	M	M	M	M	88.2%
San Luis Obispo	122	M	M	M	M	M	M	88.5%
Tri-City	203	M	M	M	M	L	M	72.4%
Madera	108	M	M	M	M	L	M	81.5%
Mariposa	25	M	M	M	M	L	M	84.0%
Tehama	36	M	M	M	L	M	L	58.3%
Inyo	28	M	M	M	L	L	M	75.0%
Butte	344	M	M	M	L	L	L	69.2%
Modoc	72	M	M	M	L	L	L	69.4%
San Joaquin	1875	M	M	M	L	L	L	72.1%
Los Angeles	7463	M	M	L	M	M	M	85.2%
San Mateo	105	M	M	L	M	L	M	77.1%
Kings	88	M	M	L	L	L	L	67.0%
Plumas	43	M	L	M	L	L	L	62.8%
Siskiyou	225	M	L	M	L	L	L	81.3%
Ventura	910	M	L	L	M	L	L	68.0%
Solano	141	M	L	L	L	L	M	61.0%
Colusa	SN							

2. Discharged Partners

2.1 Percent of Partners who Met Goals Upon Discharge by Length of Service Group, Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year




In Sections 2 - 4, all discharged partners in a FY who met selection criteria were included in the analyses, regardless of their admission year. Partners are discharged from the FSP for a variety of reasons. One reason is that partners have met their goals within the program.

As seen in 2.1, the proportion of partners who met their goals increased with increasing time spent in the program. Some partners were able to meet their goals within six months or less of service, and these proportions vary by region. This is supported by the diverse needs of the populations served by each region, as each county may serve a heterogeneous set of partners with an assortment of needs requiring a variety of program intensities.

As seen in 2.2, approximately half of Child partners, one quarter of TAY and Adult partners, and nearly one third of Older Adult partners were discharged for having met their goals within the FSP program for both fiscal years included in this report. Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-3.





The graphs in 2.3 represent the proportion of partners who met their goals upon discharge by length of service for each age group across regions. Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-4.

2.2 Percent of Partners who Met Goals Upon Discharge, by Age Group & Fiscal Year




2. Discharged Partners

2.3 Percent of Partners who Met Their Goal by Length of Service Group, by Age Group, Statewide, Region & Fiscal Year



2. Discharged Partners




Considering only those partners who had been served for a year or more upon discharge, the maps in 2.4 and 2.5 represent the percent of partners discharged who had met their goal in FY11 and FY12.

As seen in 2.4, over half of the partners discharged had met their goals within ten counties (Glenn, Kings, Los Angeles, Merced, Orange, San Mateo, Santa Cruz, Solano, Stanislaus, Tulare).

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-5.

2. Discharged Partners




As seen in 2.5, over half of the partners discharged after one or more years in the FSP program had met their goals within nine counties (Amador, Kings, Los Angeles, Merced, Napa, Orange, San Mateo, Santa Cruz, Stanislaus).

Seven counties (Kings, Los Angeles, Merced, Orange, San Mateo, Santa Cruz, Stanislaus) discharged over half of their partners for the reason of having “met goals” in both FY11 and FY12.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-5.

3. Homelessness or Emergency Shelter (Discharged)

3.1 Percent of Partners Homeless or in Emergency Shelter at Admit and Discharge, Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year




As seen in 3.1, among the partners discharged in FY11 and FY12, approximately 10-15% began the partnership with a residential status as homeless or in an emergency shelter and only 5-7% were discharged with that status.

As seen in 3.2, the largest decreases were seen for Adults and Older Adults for both FY11 and FY12. Of Adult partners discharged in FY11 and FY12, 17.5% and 20.5% began the partnership with a residential status as homeless or in an emergency shelter, respectively. Those values dropped by over half upon discharge, with only 8.5% of Adults discharged in FY11 and 9.1% of Adults discharged in FY12 having a residential status as homeless or in an emergency shelter.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-6.

3.2 Percent of Partners Homeless or in Emergency Shelter at Admit and Discharge, by Age Group & Fiscal Year




3. Homelessness or Emergency Shelter (Discharged)

As seen in 3.3, a majority of partners discharged in FY11 and FY12 statewide who began a partnership with a residential status of homeless or in an emergency shelter were no longer homeless or in an emergency shelter upon discharge. In the Central region, 62.8% of partners discharged in FY11 and 63.4% of partners discharged in FY12 were no longer homeless or in an emergency shelter.


As seen in 3.4, older adults had the greatest success rates (71.2% in FY11 and 61.5% in FY12) in moving from a residential status of homeless or emergency shelter to an improved residential status at discharge. For adults, the success rate was 53.2% in FY11 and 51.9% in FY12. Approximately forty percent of TAY who began the partnership with a residential status of homeless or in an emergency shelter experienced improvements in residential status at discharge.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-7.

3.3 Percent of Partners No Longer Homeless or in Emergency Shelter at Discharge (but not incarcerated), Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year




3.4 Percent of Partners No Longer Homeless or in Emergency Shelter at Discharge (but not incarcerated), by Age Group & Fiscal Year



4. Primary Care Physician (Discharged)

4.1 Percent of Partners with Primary Care Physician in the Past Year, Beginning, and at Discharge, Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year




As seen in 4.1, 77.2% of partners discharged in FY11 and 79.2% of partners discharged in FY12 had a primary care physician, which was an approximate 10% increase in partners with a primary care physician from the time of FSP program enrollment (Beginning). In the Central region, 81.5% partners discharged in FY11 and 84.3% of partners discharged in FY12 had a primary care physician, which was an approximate 13-14% increase in partners with a primary care physician from the time of FSP program enrollment (Beginning). In Los Angeles, a relatively smaller proportion of partners had a physician upon enrollment at the beginning of the partnership, at 62.2% in FY11 and 64.2% in FY12, but the proportion increased by approximately 11% upon discharge with 73.3% of discharged partners in FY11 and 75.1% of discharged partners in FY12 having a primary care physician. At nearly 80%, Superior region had the largest proportion of partners with a primary care physician at the beginning of the program in both FY11 and FY12.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-8.

4. Primary Care Physician (Discharged)

4.2 Percent of Partners with Primary Care Physician in the Past Year, Beginning, and at Discharge, by Age Group & Fiscal Year




As seen in 4.2, over 90% of Child and Older Adult partners discharged in FY11 and FY12 had a primary care physician, which was an approximate 5% increase for Child partners and an approximate 13% increase for Older Adult partners as compared to the beginning of the partnership.

The outcomes were different for TAY and Adult partners, with far fewer beginning the partnership with a primary care physician, at approximately 50-60% of partners with a primary care physician at the beginning of partnership. For TAY partners at discharge, 64.3% in FY11 and 67.9% in FY12 had a primary care physician. For Adult partners at discharge, the proportions were slightly better in that 72.9% in FY11 and 71.9% in FY12 had a primary care physician, representing over a 15% increase from the beginning of partnership for both years.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-8.

4. Primary Care Physician (Discharged)




As mapped in 4.3 and 4.4, counties had varying success rates increasing the proportion of partners with a primary care physician upon discharged. In FY11, two smaller counties, El Dorado and Santa Cruz were able to improve the proportion of partners with a primary care physician upon discharge by 15% to 20% such that all of the partners discharged in that year who had complete data had a primary care physician. It should be noted that Santa Cruz only had complete data for 30.3% of partners discharged in that year (See Appendix Table A-9 for further details).

Six other counties, including Lake, Fresno, Placer, San Joaquin, Tulare and Tri-City, greatly increased (>15% increase) the proportion of partners with a primary care physician from the beginning of the partnership to discharge.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-9.

4. Primary Care Physician (Discharged)



As seen in 4.4, one small county, Calaveras, was able to improve the proportion of partners with a primary care physician upon discharge by 10% such that all of the partners discharged in that year had a primary care physician. Six other counties, including Fresno, Humboldt, Madera, Napa, Stanislaus and Yolo greatly increased (>15% increase) the proportion of partners with a primary care physician from the beginning to discharge.

Fresno County was the only county which experienced more than a 15% increase in partners with a primary care physician from the beginning of partnership to discharge for both FY11 (28.8%) and FY12 (20.0%).

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-9.

5. Partners Admitted and Retained


Sections 2 - 4 of the report displayed outcomes for partners discharged in two fiscal years, FY11 and FY12. The remainder of this report, Sections 6 - 11, display outcomes for partners reaching their first year of service in the FSP program in FY11 or FY12. These sections compare the first year of service to the information collected for the year before partnership. In order for partners first year of service to be compared to prior years, the partner must be retained in service for one full year, whether continuously served or served non-continuously. Thus, this section, Section 5, displays information about the cohorts of partners enrolled in FY10 and FY11, who when retained, reach the anniversary of one year of service in FY11 and FY12, the years of focus for this report.

As seen in 5.1, 12,918 partners were admitted in FY10 and 8,287 (64.2%) of those partners reached one year of service in FY11, while the remainder were discharged before a full year within the FSP program. In FY11, 10,909 partners were admitted and 6,513 (59.7%) of those partners reached one year of service in FY12, while the remainder were discharged before a full year within the FSP program. Those partners discharged in FY11 or FY12, whether or not served for one full year, were evaluated in the prior sections which presented discharged partners.


As seen in 5.2, the proportion of partners retained for one full year varies by region, and as seen in graphs 5.3 and 5.4, these differences can relate to differences in age groups served. As seen in 5.3, the average length of service varies significantly by age group.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-10.

5.1 Total Number of Partners Served & Retained for 1 Year, Statewide by Fiscal Year




5.2 Percent of Partners Retained 1 Year, Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year



5. Partners Admitted and Retained

5.3 Percent of Partners Retained by All Length Categories Statewide, by Age Group & Fiscal Year







The proportion of partners admitted who were retained for one full year varies by age group. As seen in 5.3, statewide only 50-55% of Child and TAY partners admitted in FY10 or FY11 were retained in service for one year or more, while 70-75% of Adults and Older Adults were retained for one full year or more of service for those same years. Comparatively, 70-75% of Child and TAY partners admitted in FY10 or FY11 were retained for *six months* or longer. Thus, 25-30% of Child and TAY partners are discharged before 6 months of service. Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-10.

As shown previously in 2.3, as many as one third of Child partners who are discharged before six months have met their goals in the program. However, less than 15% of TAY partners served for less than six months who were discharged in FY11 and FY12 had met their goals in the program.

As displayed in 5.4, the length of time partners are retained in service varies by region within the same age groups, especially for Child and TAY partners. For Child and TAY partners, the Southern region retained proportionally fewer partners for six months or longer as compared to other regions. Rates of retention were similar across Adult partners for all regions. The Bay Area, Los Angeles and Superior regions showed higher rates of retention for Older Adult partners for both FY10 and FY11 as compared to other regions. Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-11.


5. Partners Admitted and Retained

5.4 Percent of Partners Retained by All Length Categories, by Age Group, Statewide & Region & Fiscal Year



This page was intentionally left blank to
support the alignment of maps during
duplex printing

5. Partners Admitted and Retained




As seen in 5.5, there were nine counties which retained more than 85% of Child and TAY partners admitted in FY10 for six months or longer, and those counties include: Los Angeles, Napa, Placer, Sacramento, San Benito, San Mateo, Solano, Stanislaus and Sutter-Yuba.

It should be noted that Sonoma County has no discharged partners for any years of FSP program, which potentially signifies a low data quality (LQ) with regard to discharging partners for this county. Thus Sonoma County was categorized as Data Not Available in the DCR for maps 5.5 through 5.8.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-12.

5. Partners Admitted and Retained




As seen in 5.6, there were four counties which retained more than 85% of Child and TAY partners admitted in FY11 for six months or longer, and those counties include: Los Angeles, Madera, Sacramento and Yolo.

Two counties (Los Angeles and Sacramento) retained greater than 85% of Child and TAY partners for six months or longer for both years FY10 and FY11. An additional six counties (Contra Costa, Nevada, Placer, San Mateo, Stanislaus and Sutter-Yuba) retained 75% of Child and TAY partners for six months or longer for both FY10 and FY11.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-12.


5. Partners Admitted and Retained



As seen in 5.7, there were 21 counties which retained more than 85% of Adult and Older Adult partners admitted in FY10 for one year or longer.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-13.

5. Partners Admitted and Retained




As seen in 5.8, there were 20 counties which retained more than 85% of Adult and Older Adult partners admitted in FY11 for one year or longer.

Fourteen counties (Amador, Butte, El Dorado, Fresno, Humboldt, Nevada, Placer, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San Joaquin, Sutter-Yuba and Ventura) retained greater than 85% of Adult and Older Adult partners for one year or longer for both years FY10 and FY11.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-13.

6. Education (1 Year)

6.1 Percent of Child Partners with Attendance Always or Most of the Time in the Beginning versus 1 Year, Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year




Between 50% to 75% of Child partners reaching 1 year had evaluable attendance and grade data at baseline and one year (See Appendix Table A-14). For those with evaluable data, as seen in 6.1, more Child partners had attendance always or most of the time at one year as compared to the beginning of the partnership in most regions and statewide. Statewide, the proportion of Child partners who achieved attendance all or most of the time increased from 82.4% at the beginning of partnerships to 86.2% at one year in FY11. Similarly, an increase was seen from 80.2% in the beginning to 86.1% at one year for FY12

As seen in 6.2, an additional 1-5% of partners had an improvement in attendance from beginning to one year, although not achieving attendance always or most of the time.


Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-14.

6.2 Percent of Child Partners with Attendance Always, Most of the Time, or Improved, Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year



6. Education (1 Year)

6.3 Percent of Child Partners with Good or Very Good Grades in the Beginning and at 1 Year, Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year




For those with evaluable data, as seen in 6.3, more Child partners had good or very good grades at one year as compared to the beginning of the partnership in most regions and statewide. Statewide, the proportion of Child partners who achieved good or very good grades increased from 21.8% at the beginning of partnerships to 29.7% at one year of service in FY11. Similarly, an increase was seen from 21.5% in the beginning to 27.4% at one year for FY12.

As seen in 6.4, an additional 6-22% of partners had an improvement in grades from beginning to one year, although not achieving good or very good grades. Thus, at one year nearly half of Child partners statewide had good, very good or improved grades.


Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-15.

6.4 Percent of Child Partners with Good, Very Good, or Improved Grades at 1 Year, Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year



7. Employment (1 Year)

7.1 Percent of Partners with Employment Goals, of Total Reaching 1 Year of Service, Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year




Some partners can have employment goals in the FSP program, and the PAF and KET assessments signify if partners have employment goals. For Child partners, this may represent goals for the family, such as employment for a caregiver. The data in this section represent only those partners who were identified as having employment goals on a PAF or KET assessment at some point in the first year of their partnership.

As seen in 7.1, the proportion of partners finishing one year of service in a fiscal year who had employment goals at some point during the first year of partnership ranges from approximately 20% to 40%, depending on the region. On average, 28.5% in FY11 and 30.3% in FY12 had employment goals, statewide.

Supporting data can be found in in Appendix Table A-16.

7.2 Percent of Partners with Employment Goals, of Total Reaching 1 Year of Service, by Age Group & Fiscal Year



7. Employment (1 Year)


As seen in 7.2, the proportion of partners with employment goals is greatest for TAY, in that over 55% of TAY had employment goals in FY11 and FY12, statewide. For Adult partners, 29.3% in FY11 and 37.7% in FY12 had employment goals during the first year of service.

As seen in 7.3, 7% to 10% of partners statewide with employment goals had any kind of employment at the beginning of partnership. In Los Angeles, only 4% to 5% of partners began the partnership with some kind of employment.


As seen in 7.4, during the partnership, 10% to 11% of partners with employment goals began some kind of new employment, with those proportions being highest in the Bay Area and Southern regions, where 15% to 18% began new employment during the partnership.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-16.

7.3 Percent of Partners with Any Employment at Beginning of Partnership for Partners with Employment Goals, Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year




7.4 Percent of Partners Attempting Any Employment During Partnership for Partners with Employment Goals, Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year



8. Arrests (1 Year)

8.1 Percent of Partners with Arrests in the Year Before and Year During Partnership, Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year (TAY, Adult, Older Adult only; Excludes Counties with LQ)



The graphs and maps in 8.1 through 8.4 display information about the proportion of TAY, Adult and Older Adult partners reporting one or more arrests in the year before or the first year of partnership for partners reaching one year of service in FY11 or FY12.


As seen in the statewide bars of 8.1, 21.7% of partners reaching 1 year of service in FY11 and 23.7% of partners reaching 1 year of service in FY12 reported having at least one arrest in the year before entering partnership. During the first year of partnership, only 4.1% in FY11 and 4.6% in FY12 reported having one or more arrests during the first year of partnership.

The Bay Area region served the greatest proportion of partners with arrests in the year before partnership with 37.7% of partners reaching one year of service in FY11 and 31.9% of partners reaching 1 year of service in FY12 having at least one arrest in the year before entering partnership. In the first year of partnership, however, only 6.2% of partners in the Bay Area region reported having one or more arrests for FY11 and FY12.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-17.

8. Arrests (1 Year)

8.2 Percent of Partners with Arrests in the Year Before and Year During Partnership, by Age Group & Fiscal Year (Excludes Counties with LQ)




As seen in 8.2, as compared to other age groups, a larger proportion of TAY (30.4% of TAY reaching 1 year of service in FY11 and 27.7% of TAY reaching one year of service in FY12) reported having one or more arrests in the year before partnership, and this number was reduced to 5.1% and 8.0% during the first year of partnership in FY11 and FY12, respectively.

Approximately 20% to 25% of Adult partners reaching one year of service reported having an arrest in the year before partnership, and this was reduced to approximately four percent reporting one or more arrests in the first year of partnership for both years FY11 and FY12.

Less than 10 percent of Older Adults reaching one year of service reported having an arrest in the year before partnership, and this was reduced to approximately one to one and a half percent reporting one or more arrests in the first year of partnership for both years FY11 and FY12.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-17.

8. Arrests (1 Year)




The maps in 8.3 and 8.4 display the change in the proportion of TAY, Adult and Older Adult partners with arrests in the year before to the first year of partnership.

For partners reaching one year of services in FY11, thirteen counties greatly reduced (greater than or equal to 15%) the proportion of partners who reported an arrest in the year before as compared to the first year of partnership, and an additional seven counties who served partners with arrests in the year before partnership reported no arrests for any partners in the first year of partnership (signified in map as "ALL" reduced).

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-18.

8. Arrests (1 Year)




For partners reaching one year of services in FY12, fourteen counties greatly reduced the proportion of partners (by greater than or equal to 15%) who reported an arrest in the year before as compared to the first year of partnership, and an additional three counties who served partners with arrests in the year before partnership reported no arrests for any partners in the first year of partnership.

Eleven counties (El Dorado, Fresno, Imperial, Kern, Los Angeles, Madera, Orange, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara and Tulare) experienced over a 15% reduction or a complete reduction in partners with arrests from the year before to the first year of partnership in both FY11 and FY12.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-18.

9. Incarcerations (1 Year)

9.1 Percent of Partners with Incarcerations in the Year Before and Year During Partnership, Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year (TAY, Adult, Older Adult; Excludes Counties with LQ)



The graphs and maps in 9.1 through 9.4 display information about incarcerations. Incarceration includes residential settings or discharge reasons within the first year which related to Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), Juvenile Hall/Camp, Jail, or Prison. Thus, the subpopulation for this section differs from the other sections in that partners are included based on either completing a full year of service or discharge reason within the first year relating to incarceration. Due to that difference, the total number of partners served may reflect a slight increase over other sections in this report.


As seen in the statewide bars of 9.1, 18.1% of partners for FY11 and 20.1% of partners for FY12 reported having an incarceration in the year before entering partnership. During the first year of partnership, 12.1% in FY11 and 13.6% in FY12 reported a residential setting or a discharge reason which related to incarceration.

The Bay Area region served the greatest proportion of partners with incarcerations in the year before partnership with 36.1% of partners in FY11 and 32.0% of partners in FY12. In the first year of partnership, 23.3% and 21.1% of partners in the Bay Area region reported having a residential setting or a discharge reason which related to incarceration for FY11 and FY12, respectively.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-19.

9. Incarcerations (1 Year)

9.2 Percent of Partners with Incarcerations in the Year Before and Year During Partnership, by Age Group & Fiscal Year (Excludes Counties with LQ)




Presented in 9.2, as compared to other age groups, a larger proportion of TAY served (24.5% of TAY for FY11 and 23.5% of TAY for FY12) reported incarceration in the year before partnership, and this number was reduced to 18.1% and 19.4% during the first year of partnership in FY11 and FY12, respectively.

Approximately 17-21% of Adult partners reported incarceration in the year before partnership, and this was reduced by approximately seven percent reporting incarceration in the first year of partnership for both years FY11 and FY12.

Approximately five percent of Older Adult partners served reported incarceration in the year before partnership, and this was reduced slightly to approximately three to four percent reporting incarceration in the first year of partnership for both years FY11 and FY12.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-19.


9. Incarcerations (1 Year)



For partners in FY11, five counties (Kern, Orange, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara and Solano) greatly reduced the proportion of partners (by greater than or equal to 10%) who reported incarceration in the year before as compared to the first year of partnership, and an additional one county (Siskiyou) who served partners with incarceration in the year before partnership reported no incarceration for any partners in the first year of partnership.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-20.

9. Incarcerations (1 Year)




For partners in FY12, nine counties (Glenn, El Dorado, Kern, Lake, Madera, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara and Sutter-Yuba) greatly reduced the proportion of partners (by greater than or equal to 10%) who reported incarceration in the year before as compared to the first year of partnership, and an additional one county (Humboldt) who served partners with incarceration in the year before partnership reported no incarceration for any partners in the first year of partnership.

Kern, San Luis Obispo and Santa Clara counties experienced over a 10% reduction in incarceration from the year before to the first year of partnership for partners reaching one year of service for both FY11 and FY12.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-20.

10. Emergencies (1 Year)

10.1 Percent of Partners with Mental Health or Substance Abuse Emergencies in Year Before and Year During Partnership, Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year (Excludes Counties with LQ)



The graphs and maps in 10.1 through 10.4 display information about mental health or substance abuse emergency events for partners reaching one year of service in FY11 or FY12.


As seen in the statewide bars of 10.1, 34.8% of partners for FY11 and 38.1% of partners for FY12 reported having a mental health or substance abuse related emergency in the year before entering partnership. During the first year of partnership, 9.9% in FY11 and 8.1% in FY12 reported a mental health or substance abuse related emergency, reflecting approximately 25% to 30% fewer partners overall with a mental health or substance abuse related emergency in the first year as compared to the year before partnership.

Between 30% to 40% of partners reaching one year of service had a mental health or substance abuse related emergency in the year before within all regions for both fiscal years. As compared to the year before partnership, all regions reported a decrease in the proportion of partners experiencing an event in the first year of service, to a first year proportion of between 4.5% and 16.5% for all regions.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-21.

10. Emergencies (1 Year)

10.2 Percent of Partners with Mental Health or Substance Abuse Emergencies in Year Before and Year During Partnership, by Age Group & Fiscal Year (Excludes Counties with LQ)




As seen in 10.2, as compared to other age groups, a larger proportion of TAY (41.9% in FY11 and 45.0% in FY12) and Adult (40.9% in FY11 and 46.8% in FY12) partners served reported mental health or substance abuse related emergencies in the year before partnership, and this number was reduced to approximately 10% to 11% for TAY and 10% to 13% for Adult partners during the first year of partnership in FY11 and FY12.

Approximately one third of Older Adult partners reported a mental health or substance abuse related emergency in the year before partnership, and this was reduced in the first year of partnership to 10.3% in FY11 and 6.2% in FY12.

In FY11, 16.0% and in FY12, 19.2% of Child partners experienced a mental health or substance abuse related emergency in the year before partnership, and this was reduced such that only about four percent of Child partners reported an event in the first year of partnership for both FY11 and FY12.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-21.


10. Emergencies (1 Year)



For partners reaching one year of service in FY11, 16 counties greatly reduced the proportion of partners (by greater than or equal to 25%) who reported a mental health or substance abuse related emergency event in the year before as compared to the first year of partnership, and an additional two counties who served partners with events in the year before partnership reported no events for any partners in the first year of partnership.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-22.

10. Emergencies (1 Year)




For partners reaching one year of service in FY12, 20 counties greatly reduced the proportion of partners (by greater than or equal to 25%) who reported a mental health or substance abuse related emergency event in the year before as compared to the first year of partnership, and an additional two counties who served partners with events in the year before partnership reported no events for any partners in the first year of partnership.

Fourteen counties (El Dorado, Fresno, Kern, Madera, Napa, San Francisco, San Joaquin, Santa Clara, Shasta, Siskiyou, Solano, Stanislaus, Yolo and Sutter-Yuba) experienced over a 25% reduction or a complete reduction in partners with mental health or substance abuse related emergencies from the year before to the first year of partnership in both FY11 and FY12.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-22.

11. Hospitalizations (1 Year)

11.1 Percent of Partners with Psychiatric Hospitalizations (non-State) in Year Before and Year During Partnership, Statewide & Region by Fiscal Year (Excludes Counties with LQ)



The graphs and maps in 11.1 through 11.4 display the proportion of partners who reported a residential setting of “Nursing Psychiatric” or “Psychiatric Hospital” in the year before or the first year during FSP partnership for those reaching one year of service in FY11 or FY12. Note that the definition of psychiatric hospitalization in this report does not include the residential setting of “State Psychiatric”.


As seen in the statewide bars of 11.1, 22.3% of partners for FY11 and 26.3% of partners for FY12 reported having non-state psychiatric hospitalization in the year before entering partnership. During the first year of partnership, 15.0% in FY11 and 15.5% in FY12 reported non-state psychiatric hospitalization, reflecting between 7% and 11% fewer overall partners with non-state psychiatric hospitalization in the first year as compared to the year before partnership.

Between 20% to 30% of partners reaching one year of service had a non-state psychiatric hospitalization in the year before within all regions for both fiscal years. All regions reported a decrease in the proportion of partners with non-state psychiatric hospitalization in the first year of service as compared to the year before, reflecting a decrease of approximately five to fifteen percent for all regions.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-23.

11. Hospitalizations (1 Year)

11.2 Percent of Partners with Psychiatric Hospitalizations (non-State) in Year Before and Year During Partnership, by Age Group & Fiscal Year (Excludes Counties with LQ)




As seen in 11.2, approximately one quarter to one third of TAY, Adult and Older Adult partners reaching one year of service reported having a non-state psychiatric hospitalization in the year before partnership, and this proportions was reduced to approximately one fifth or less for TAY, Adult and Older Adult partners during the first year of partnership in FY11 and FY12.

In FY11, 8.9% and in FY12, 12.5% of Child partners reported a non-state psychiatric hospitalization in the year before partnership, and this was reduced such that only 6.1% in FY11 and 7.5% in FY12 of Child partners reported similar hospitalization in the first year of partnership.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-23.


11. Hospitalizations (1 Year)



For partners reaching one year of service in FY11, nine counties greatly reduced the proportion of partners (by greater than or equal to 10%) who reported a non-state psychiatric hospitalization in the year before as compared to the first year of partnership, and an additional county who served partners with non-state psychiatric hospitalizations in the year before partnership reported no such hospitalizations for any partners in the first year of partnership.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-24.

11. Hospitalizations (1 Year)



For partners reaching one year of service in FY12, thirteen counties greatly reduced the proportion of partners (by greater than or equal to 10%) who reported a non-state psychiatric hospitalization in the year before as compared to the first year of partnership.

Fresno, Kern, Stanislaus and Yolo counties experienced over a 10% reduction in non-state psychiatric hospitalizations for partners served for both FY11 and FY12.

Supporting data can be found in Appendix Table A-24.

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-1: Data Quality for Continuous Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service for DQ.1 and DQ.2

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Served	3Ms Sub- mitted	3Ms Due in Year 1	% 3Ms	% with KET	Served	3Ms Sub- mitted	3Ms Due in Year 1	% 3Ms	% with KET
Statewide										
All Partners	8287	26126	33148	78.8	85.2	6513	20512	26052	78.7	83.5
Continuous Partners Only	7585	24149	30340	79.6	83.8	6028	19171	24112	79.5	82.1
Age										
1. Child										
All Partners	1712	5009	6848	73.1	80.9	1744	5339	6976	76.5	82.7
Continuous Partners Only	1563	4588	6252	73.4	79.1	1593	4914	6372	77.1	81.1
2. TAY										
All Partners	1730	5078	6920	73.4	83.9	1393	4232	5572	76.0	81.3
Continuous Partners Only	1515	4511	6060	74.4	81.6	1230	3789	4920	77.0	78.8
3. Adult										
All Partners	4260	14228	17040	83.5	87.5	2822	9340	11288	82.7	84.8
Continuous Partners Only	3961	13342	15844	84.2	86.5	2675	8921	10700	83.4	83.9
4. Older Adult										
All Partners	585	1811	2340	77.4	85.1	554	1601	2216	72.2	84.7
Continuous Partners Only	546	1708	2184	78.2	84.1	530	1547	2120	73.0	84.0
Region										
Bay Area										
All Partners	686	2272	2744	82.8	88.6	712	2398	2848	84.2	89.2
Continuous Partners Only	612	2058	2448	84.1	87.3	668	2281	2672	85.4	88.5
Central										
All Partners	1979	6895	7916	87.1	95.1	1318	4559	5272	86.5	88.5
Continuous Partners Only	1824	6450	7296	88.4	94.7	1236	4330	4944	87.6	87.8
Los Angeles										
All Partners	2159	6331	8636	73.3	76.1	1975	6132	7900	77.6	74.9
Continuous Partners Only	2126	6233	8504	73.3	75.8	1945	6039	7780	77.6	74.5
Southern										
All Partners	3084	9647	12336	78.2	83.9	2158	6439	8632	74.6	85.5
Continuous Partners Only	2691	8573	10764	79.6	81.6	1868	5653	7472	75.7	83.3
Superior										
All Partners	379	981	1516	64.7	89.2	350	984	1400	70.3	88.3
Continuous Partners Only	332	835	1328	62.9	87.7	311	868	1244	69.8	86.8

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-1 (cont.): Data Quality for Continuous Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service for DQ.1 and DQ.2

County	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Served	3Ms Sub- mitted	3Ms Due in Year 1	% 3Ms	% with KET	Served	3Ms Sub- mitted	3Ms Due in Year 1	% 3Ms	% with KET
Amador										
All Partners	28	7	112	6.3	89.3	15	0	60	0.0	100.0
Continuous Partners Only	26	6	104	5.8	88.5	12	0	48	0.0	100.0
Berkeley City										
All Partners	2	8	8	100.0	100.0	23	87	92	94.6	87.0
Continuous Partners Only	2	8	8	100.0	100.0	23	87	92	94.6	87.0
Butte										
All Partners	114	105	456	23.0	90.4	122	294	488	60.2	100.0
Continuous Partners Only	110	103	440	23.4	90.0	113	277	452	61.3	100.0
Calaveras										
All Partners	5	20	20	100.0	100.0	9	36	36	100.0	100.0
Continuous Partners Only	5	20	20	100.0	100.0	7	28	28	100.0	100.0
Colusa										
All Partners	6	5	24	20.8	33.3	6	0	24	0.0	0.0
Continuous Partners Only	6	5	24	20.8	33.3	6	0	24	0.0	0.0
Contra Costa										
All Partners	90	317	360	88.1	100.0	65	259	260	99.6	98.5
Continuous Partners Only	74	261	296	88.2	100.0	61	243	244	99.6	98.4
Del Norte										
All Partners	5	19	20	95.0	80.0	3	4	12	33.3	33.3
Continuous Partners Only	5	19	20	95.0	80.0	3	4	12	33.3	33.3
El Dorado										
All Partners	16	60	64	93.8	100.0	26	99	104	95.2	96.2
Continuous Partners Only	15	57	60	95.0	100.0	26	99	104	95.2	96.2
Fresno										
All Partners	218	606	872	69.5	83.9	220	742	880	84.3	88.6
Continuous Partners Only	207	572	828	69.1	83.1	206	702	824	85.2	87.9
Glenn										
All Partners	30	112	120	93.3	96.7	23	88	92	95.7	87.0
Continuous Partners Only	27	102	108	94.4	96.3	20	78	80	97.5	85.0
Humboldt										
All Partners	34	90	136	66.2	97.1	25	71	100	71.0	72.0
Continuous Partners Only	31	87	124	70.2	96.8	21	59	84	70.2	66.7
Imperial										
All Partners	164	597	656	91.0	97.0	111	392	444	88.3	97.3
Continuous Partners Only	85	323	340	95.0	94.1	70	265	280	94.6	95.7
Inyo										
All Partners	10	39	40	97.5	80.0	5	19	20	95.0	60.0
Continuous Partners Only	9	36	36	100.0	77.8	5	19	20	95.0	60.0
Kern										
All Partners	143	424	572	74.1	100.0	136	436	544	80.1	98.5
Continuous Partners Only	111	346	444	77.9	100.0	112	383	448	85.5	98.2
Kings										
All Partners	11	5	44	11.4	100.0	11	19	44	43.2	100.0
Continuous Partners Only	8	1	32	3.1	100.0	9	11	36	30.6	100.0
Lake										
All Partners	34	134	136	98.5	100.0	20	78	80	97.5	100.0
Continuous Partners Only	28	110	112	98.2	100.0	11	44	44	100.0	100.0
Lassen										
All Partners	4	16	16	100.0	100.0	6	24	24	100.0	100.0
Continuous Partners Only	2	8	8	100.0	100.0	3	12	12	100.0	100.0
Los Angeles										
All Partners	2159	6331	8636	73.3	76.1	1975	6132	7900	77.6	74.9
Continuous Partners Only	2126	6233	8504	73.3	75.8	1945	6039	7780	77.6	74.5
Madera										
All Partners	44	146	176	83.0	88.6	41	157	164	95.7	90.2
Continuous Partners Only	38	129	152	84.9	86.8	36	141	144	97.9	88.9
Mariposa										
All Partners	4	13	16	81.3	100.0	12	29	48	60.4	91.7
Continuous Partners Only	4	13	16	81.3	100.0	10	28	40	70.0	90.0
Merced										
All Partners	26	74	104	71.2	100.0	19	66	76	86.8	94.7
Continuous Partners Only	21	66	84	78.6	100.0	17	64	68	94.1	94.1
Modoc										
All Partners	6	19	24	79.2	100.0	26	69	104	66.3	92.3
Continuous Partners Only	4	13	16	81.3	100.0	25	66	100	66.0	92.0
Mono										
All Partners	1	2	4	50.0	0.0	1	2	4	50.0	100.0
Continuous Partners Only	1	2	4	50.0	0.0	1	2	4	50.0	100.0
Napa										
All Partners	27	86	108	79.6	100.0	17	60	68	88.2	100.0
Continuous Partners Only	21	68	84	81.0	100.0	15	55	60	91.7	100.0
Nevada										
All Partners	54	187	216	86.6	88.9	62	195	248	78.6	82.3
Continuous Partners Only	48	165	192	85.9	87.5	56	178	224	79.5	80.4

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-1 (cont.): Data Quality for Continuous Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service for DQ.1 and DQ.2

County	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Served	3Ms Submitted	3Ms Due in Year 1	% 3Ms	% with KET	Served	3Ms Submitted	3Ms Due in Year 1	% 3Ms	% with KET
Orange										
All Partners	323	1109	1292	85.8	97.8	376	1363	1504	90.6	96.8
Continuous Partners Only	304	1057	1216	86.9	97.7	358	1315	1432	91.8	96.6
Placer										
All Partners	38	85	152	55.9	86.8	32	43	128	33.6	71.9
Continuous Partners Only	32	70	128	54.7	84.4	30	40	120	33.3	70.0
Plumas										
All Partners	17	50	68	73.5	76.5	9	15	36	41.7	66.7
Continuous Partners Only	14	41	56	73.2	71.4	9	15	36	41.7	66.7
Sacramento										
All Partners	724	2592	2896	89.5	97.9	273	907	1092	83.1	94.9
Continuous Partners Only	677	2463	2708	91.0	97.8	264	884	1056	83.7	94.7
San Benito										
All Partners	17	68	68	100.0	100.0	5	16	20	80.0	100.0
Continuous Partners Only	17	68	68	100.0	100.0	3	12	12	100.0	100.0
San Bernardino										
All Partners	564	706	2256	31.3	67.7	412	877	1648	53.2	57.3
Continuous Partners Only	488	604	1952	30.9	62.7	365	778	1460	53.3	51.8
San Diego										
All Partners	936	3358	3744	89.7	97.3	853	2609	3412	76.5	96.2
Continuous Partners Only	807	2982	3228	92.4	96.9	711	2206	2844	77.6	95.5
San Francisco										
All Partners	141	509	564	90.2	97.9	268	983	1072	91.7	93.3
Continuous Partners Only	129	468	516	90.7	97.7	255	944	1020	92.5	92.9
San Joaquin										
All Partners	616	2382	2464	96.7	95.1	440	1670	1760	94.9	83.0
Continuous Partners Only	579	2251	2316	97.2	94.8	420	1610	1680	95.8	82.1
San Luis Obispo										
All Partners	69	250	276	90.6	100.0	41	146	164	89.0	100.0
Continuous Partners Only	50	190	200	95.0	100.0	37	136	148	91.9	100.0
San Mateo										
All Partners	33	122	132	92.4	90.9	32	126	128	98.4	90.6
Continuous Partners Only	31	116	124	93.5	90.3	30	120	120	100.0	90.0
Santa Clara										
All Partners	173	528	692	76.3	94.8	168	553	672	82.3	91.7
Continuous Partners Only	148	482	592	81.4	93.9	147	506	588	86.1	90.5
Santa Cruz										
All Partners						44	147	176	83.5	86.4
Continuous Partners Only						44	147	176	83.5	86.4
Shasta										
All Partners	33	128	132	97.0	100.0	16	63	64	98.4	100.0
Continuous Partners Only	23	92	92	100.0	100.0	15	59	60	98.3	100.0
Sierra										
All Partners	4	9	16	56.3	100.0	2	8	8	100.0	100.0
Continuous Partners Only	3	7	12	58.3	100.0	2	8	8	100.0	100.0
Siskiyou										
All Partners	14	51	56	91.1	100.0	19	57	76	75.0	94.7
Continuous Partners Only	9	35	36	97.2	100.0	18	55	72	76.4	94.4
Solano										
All Partners	68	264	272	97.1	95.6	19	55	76	72.4	89.5
Continuous Partners Only	55	217	220	98.6	94.5	19	55	76	72.4	89.5
Sonoma										
All Partners	135	370	540	68.5	55.6	71	112	284	39.4	57.7
Continuous Partners Only	135	370	540	68.5	55.6	71	112	284	39.4	57.7
Stanislaus										
All Partners	84	313	336	93.2	100.0	76	282	304	92.8	93.4
Continuous Partners Only	73	278	292	95.2	100.0	71	264	284	93.0	93.0
Sutter/Yuba										
All Partners	54	210	216	97.2	98.1	46	174	184	94.6	95.7
Continuous Partners Only	48	192	192	100.0	97.9	39	155	156	99.4	94.9
Tehama										
All Partners	18	32	72	44.4	50.0	10	14	40	35.0	40.0
Continuous Partners Only	17	28	68	41.2	47.1	8	9	32	28.1	25.0
Tri-City										
All Partners	9	20	36	55.6	77.8	114	327	456	71.7	62.3
Continuous Partners Only	9	20	36	55.6	77.8	114	327	456	71.7	62.3
Trinity										
All Partners	6	24	24	100.0	33.3	1	4	4	100.0	100.0
Continuous Partners Only	5	20	20	100.0	20.0	1	4	4	100.0	100.0
Tulare										
All Partners	80	274	320	85.6	100.0	57	185	228	81.1	86.0
Continuous Partners Only	63	228	252	90.5	100.0	52	169	208	81.3	84.6
Tuolumne										
All Partners	7	22	28	78.6	100.0	2	5	8	62.5	100.0
Continuous Partners Only	6	21	24	87.5	100.0	2	5	8	62.5	100.0
Ventura										
All Partners	876	3183	3504	90.8	68.6	115	289	460	62.8	61.7
Continuous Partners Only	837	3051	3348	91.1	67.1	101	243	404	60.1	56.4
Yolo										
All Partners	13	45	52	86.5	100.0	33	124	132	93.9	87.9
Continuous Partners Only	12	45	48	93.8	100.0	29	109	116	94.0	86.2

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-2: Definitions of History of Partner Issues Upon Enrollment for 1.3, 1.4, 1.5

Issue	Identified on PAF as...
Academic Grades	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variable 6.07 GradesCurr as 4 = Below Average or 5 = Poor (OR) Variable 6.08 GradesPast12 as 4 = Below Average or 5 = Poor
School Attendance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variable 6.05 AttendancePast12 as 4 = Infrequently attends school or 5 = Never attends school (OR) Variable 6.06 AttendanceCurr as 4 = Infrequently attends school or 5 = Never attends school (OR) Variable 6.09 SuspensionPast12 >0 (OR) Variable 6.11 ExpulsionPast12 >0 (OR) Variable 6.12 NotinschoolPast12 >0 AND Variable 6.02 HighestGrade in ("01" or "02" or "03" or "04" or "05" or "06" or "07" or "08" or "09" or "10" or "11" or "12" or "13" or "14" or "20") (OR) Variable 6.14 NotinschoolCurr = "1" AND Variable 6.02 HighestGrade in ("01" or "02" or "03" or "04" or "05" or "06" or "07" or "08" or "09" or "10" or "11" or "12" or "13" or "14" or "20")
Special Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variable 6.03 EmotionalDisturbance = "1" (OR) Variable 6.04 AnotherReason = "1"
Out of Home Residential Placement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variable 5.02 Current in ("11" or "12" or "13" or "14" or "22" or "25" or "4" or "5" or "8") (OR) Variable 5.03 Yesterday in ("11" or "12" or "13" or "14" or "22" or "25" or "4" or "5" or "8") (OR) Variable 5.17 FosterHomeRelative_PastTwelveDays >0 (OR) Variable 5.20 FosterHomeNon-relative_PastTwelveDays >0 (OR) Variable 5.38 CommunityCare_PastTwelveDays >0 (OR) Variable 5.41 MedicalHospital_PastTwelveDays >0 (OR) Variable 5.50 GroupHome0-11_PastTwelveDays >0 (OR) Variable 5.53 GroupHome12-14_PastTwelveDays >0 (OR) Variable 5.56 CommunityTreatment_PastTwelveDays >0 (OR) Variable 5.59 ResidentialTreatment_PastTwelveDays >0 (OR) Variable 5.68 Long-TermCare_PastTwelveDays >0
Emergency - Mental or Substance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variable 10.02 MenRelated >0
Emergency - Medical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variable 10.01 PhyRelated >0
Legal Involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variable 9.02 ArrestPast12 >0 (OR) Variable 9.05 ProbationStatus = "1" (OR) Variable 9.07 ProbPast12 = "1" (OR) Variable 9.09 ParoleStatus = "1" (OR) Variable 9.12 ParolePast12 = "1" (OR) Variable 5.02 Current in ("16" or "15" or "26" or "27") (OR) Variable 5.03 Yesterday in ("16" or "15" or "26" or "27") (OR) Variable 5.71 JuvenileHall/Camp_PastTwelveDays >0 (OR) Variable 5.74 DJJ_PastTwelveDays >0 (OR) Variable 5.77 Jail_PastTwelveDays >0 (OR) Variable 5.80 Prison_PastTwelveDays >0 (OR) Variable 5.81 Prison_PriorTwelve = "1"
Inpatient Psychiatric	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variable 5.02 Current in ("9" or "10" or "24") (OR) Variable 5.03 Yesterday in ("9" or "10" or "24") (OR) Variable 5.47 StatePsychiatric_PastTwelveDays >0 (OR) Variable 5.62 NursingPsychiatric_PastTwelveDays >0 (OR) Variable 5.44 PsychiatricHospital_PastTwelveDays >0
Substance Abuse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variable 12.02 ActiveProblem = "1" (OR) Variable 12.03 AbuseServices = "1" (OR) Variable 12.01 MentalIllness = "1"
Homeless/ Emergency Shelter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variable 5.02 Current in ("6" Or "7") (OR) Variable 5.03 Yesterday in ("6" Or "7") (OR) Variable 5.23 EmergencyShelter_PastTwelveDays >0 (OR) Variable 5.26 Homeless_PastTwelveDays >0

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-3: Partners Discharged who Met Goals for 2.1 & 2.2

	FY-2010/2011			FY-2011/2012		
	Partners who Met Goals		Partners Discharged n	Partners who Met Goals		Partners Discharged n
	n	%		n	%	
Statewide						
Total	3063	34.3	8921	3024	35.6	8488
a) < 6 Months	590	23.5	2513	532	22.6	2350
b) 6 to <12 Months	782	36.0	2175	743	36.8	2020
c) 1 Year+	1691	39.9	4233	1749	42.5	4118
Age Group						
1. Child						
a) < 6 Months	387	36.1	1072	352	37.1	948
b) 6 to <12 Months	415	52.5	791	421	54.0	780
c) 1 Year+	552	61.7	895	642	61.1	1051
2. TAY						
a) < 6 Months	113	14.7	769	98	13.7	715
b) 6 to <12 Months	195	30.2	645	160	28.7	558
c) 1 Year+	358	34.6	1035	313	35.6	879
3. Adult						
a) < 6 Months	60	10.5	574	54	9.5	567
b) 6 to <12 Months	149	23.4	637	113	20.4	555
c) 1 Year+	676	34.0	1990	675	36.0	1873
4. Older Adult						
a) < 6 Months	30	30.6	98	28	23.3	120
b) 6 to <12 Months	23	22.5	102	49	38.6	127
c) 1 Year+	105	33.5	313	119	37.8	315
Region						
Bay Area						
a) < 6 Months	44	19.6	224	38	17.2	221
b) 6 to <12 Months	56	29.0	193	71	33.6	211
c) 1 Year+	225	44.1	510	234	46.4	504
Central						
a) < 6 Months	73	18.5	394	49	14.5	339
b) 6 to <12 Months	92	24.1	382	116	31.0	374
c) 1 Year+	295	36.4	810	294	34.4	855
Los Angeles						
a) < 6 Months	48	17.1	280	58	18.1	321
b) 6 to <12 Months	188	43.3	434	175	42.0	417
c) 1 Year+	609	52.8	1154	581	54.2	1072
Southern						
a) < 6 Months	386	26.1	1480	359	26.9	1336
b) 6 to <12 Months	401	38.0	1056	348	38.4	907
c) 1 Year+	481	31.0	1554	556	38.1	1460
Superior						
a) < 6 Months	39	28.9	135	28	21.1	133
b) 6 to <12 Months	45	40.9	110	33	29.7	111
c) 1 Year+	81	39.5	205	84	37.0	227

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-4: Partners Discharged who Met Goals for 2.3

Region - Age Group	FY-2010/2011			FY-2011/2012		
	Partners who Met Goals		Partners Discharged	Partners who Met Goals		Partners Discharged
	n	%	n	n	%	n
Bay Area-1. Child						
a) < 6 Months	10	18.2	55	11	21.2	52
b) 6 to <12 Months	17	29.3	58	29	42.0	69
c) 1 Year+	74	68.5	108	83	53.9	154
Bay Area-2. TAY						
a) < 6 Months	21	24.1	87	14	19.4	72
b) 6 to <12 Months	26	41.9	62	22	34.9	63
c) 1 Year+	70	45.5	154	74	52.5	141
Bay Area-3. Adult						
a) < 6 Months	5	7.5	67	11	12.5	88
b) 6 to <12 Months	10	15.2	66	15	22.7	66
c) 1 Year+	66	33.2	199	65	36.1	180
Bay Area-4. Older Adult						
a) < 6 Months	8	53.3	15	SN	SN	9
b) 6 to <12 Months	SN	SN	7	5	38.5	13
c) 1 Year+	15	30.6	49	12	41.4	29
Central-1. Child						
a) < 6 Months	32	20.4	157	17	15.9	107
b) 6 to <12 Months	41	38.7	106	57	45.2	126
c) 1 Year+	68	50.0	136	80	48.2	166
Central-2. TAY						
a) < 6 Months	6	7.1	84	12	11.9	101
b) 6 to <12 Months	22	22.4	98	17	19.8	86
c) 1 Year+	55	32.9	167	51	29.7	172
Central-3. Adult						
a) < 6 Months	28	20.9	134	17	15.2	112
b) 6 to <12 Months	27	18.4	147	27	20.6	131
c) 1 Year+	149	34.2	436	141	31.3	451
Central-4. Older Adult						
a) < 6 Months	7	36.8	19	3	15.8	19
b) 6 to <12 Months	2	6.5	31	15	48.4	31
c) 1 Year+	23	32.4	71	22	33.3	66
Los Angeles-1. Child						
a) < 6 Months	39	28.1	139	48	29.8	161
b) 6 to <12 Months	139	55.4	251	128	55.9	229
c) 1 Year+	250	68.7	364	279	71.5	390
Los Angeles-2. TAY						
a) < 6 Months	4	7.4	54	7	15.2	46
b) 6 to <12 Months	23	37.1	62	24	42.9	56
c) 1 Year+	93	59.6	156	51	47.7	107
Los Angeles-3. Adult						
a) < 6 Months	3	4.1	74	2	2.2	91
b) 6 to <12 Months	26	22.2	117	21	17.2	122
c) 1 Year+	236	40.5	583	238	44.5	535
Los Angeles-4. Older Adult						
a) < 6 Months	2	15.4	13	1	4.3	23
b) 6 to <12 Months	SN	SN	4	2	20.0	10
c) 1 Year+	30	58.8	51	13	32.5	40
Region - Age Group	FY-2010/2011			FY-2011/2012		
	Partners who Met Goals		Partners Discharged	Partners who Met Goals		Partners Discharged
	n	%	n	n	%	n
Southern-1. Child						
a) < 6 Months	290	43.0	675	270	45.1	599
b) 6 to <12 Months	202	58.7	344	195	60.0	325
c) 1 Year+	133	55.0	242	184	61.3	300
Southern-2. TAY						
a) < 6 Months	70	14.0	499	60	13.1	457
b) 6 to <12 Months	115	28.8	399	91	27.7	329
c) 1 Year+	127	25.0	509	123	29.8	413
Southern-3. Adult						
a) < 6 Months	13	5.0	258	11	5.0	218
b) 6 to <12 Months	70	26.5	264	37	19.7	188
c) 1 Year+	188	28.0	671	184	30.9	596
Southern-4. Older Adult						
a) < 6 Months	13	27.1	48	18	29.0	62
b) 6 to <12 Months	14	28.6	49	25	38.5	65
c) 1 Year+	33	25.0	132	65	43.0	151
Superior-1. Child						
a) < 6 Months	16	34.8	46	6	20.7	29
b) 6 to <12 Months	16	50.0	32	12	38.7	31
c) 1 Year+	27	60.0	45	16	39.0	41
Superior-2. TAY						
a) < 6 Months	12	26.7	45	5	12.8	39
b) 6 to <12 Months	9	37.5	24	6	25.0	24
c) 1 Year+	13	26.5	49	14	30.4	46
Superior-3. Adult						
a) < 6 Months	11	26.8	41	13	22.4	58
b) 6 to <12 Months	16	37.2	43	13	27.1	48
c) 1 Year+	37	36.6	101	47	42.3	111
Superior-4. Older Adult						
a) < 6 Months	SN	SN	3	SN	SN	7
b) 6 to <12 Months	4	36.4	11	SN	SN	8
c) 1 Year+	4	40.0	10	7	24.1	29

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-5: Discharged Partners Served at Least 1 Year or More who Met Goals for 2.4 & 2.5

County	FY-2010/2011			FY-2011/2012		
	Partners who Met Goals		Partners Discharged (Served 1+ Yrs)	Partners who Met Goals		Partners Discharged (Served 1+ Yrs)
	n	%		n	%	
Amador	SN	SN	7	6	54.5	11
Berkeley City	SN	SN	0	SN	SN	1
Butte	12	44.4	27	22	43.1	51
Calaveras	SN	SN	5	SN	SN	7
Colusa	SN	SN	6	SN	SN	0
Contra Costa	39	33.9	115	43	43.9	98
Del Norte	SN	SN	4	SN	SN	0
El Dorado	SN	SN	6	4	23.5	17
Fresno	80	47.9	167	93	48.2	193
Glenn	13	56.5	23	7	46.7	15
Humboldt	0	0.0	13	2	16.7	12
Imperial	23	24.2	95	13	15.7	83
Inyo	SN	SN	5	SN	SN	1
Kern	47	42.3	111	39	31.5	124
Kings	15	83.3	18	17	89.5	19
Lake	11	47.8	23	8	34.8	23
Lassen	SN	SN	1	SN	SN	9
Los Angeles	609	52.8	1154	581	54.2	1072
Madera	3	10.7	28	2	6.9	29
Mariposa	1	10.0	10	SN	SN	9
Merced	23	59.0	39	18	81.8	22
Modoc	SN	SN	3	5	41.7	12
Mono	SN	SN	1	SN	SN	0
Napa	11	47.8	23	18	66.7	27
Nevada	26	47.3	55	20	40.0	50
Orange	150	51.4	292	146	54.1	270
Placer	4	17.4	23	6	31.6	19
Plumas	3	27.3	11	SN	SN	0
Sacramento	53	30.6	173	46	24.0	192
San Benito	SN	SN	6	6	50.0	12
San Bernardino	104	35.5	293	84	30.9	272
San Diego	99	32.1	308	217	39.5	550
San Francisco	60	48.4	124	64	44.4	144
San Joaquin	38	24.5	155	21	11.7	179
San Luis Obispo	20	44.4	45	14	32.6	43
San Mateo	16	57.1	28	14	51.9	27
Santa Clara	56	40.3	139	70	45.5	154
Santa Cruz	8	80.0	10	8	57.1	14
Shasta	8	50.0	16	5	17.2	29
Sierra	SN	SN	3	SN	SN	5
Siskiyou	2	16.7	12	4	26.7	15
Solano	33	50.8	65	11	40.7	27
Stanislaus	30	52.6	57	35	57.4	61
Sutter/Yuba	9	23.7	38	6	23.1	26
Tehama	SN	SN	6	SN	SN	5
Tri-City	SN	SN	0	10	30.3	33
Trinity	SN	SN	2	SN	SN	1
Tulare	23	53.5	43	19	46.3	41
Tuolumne	SN	SN	5	SN	SN	8
Ventura	38	9.3	410	33	38.8	85
Yolo	11	36.7	30	7	33.3	21

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-6: Discharged Partners with a Residential Status of Homeless or Emergency Shelter at Admission or at Discharge for 3.1 & 3.2

	Homeless or Emergency Shelter at Admission				Homeless or Emergency Shelter at Discharge				Total Served	
	FY11		FY12		FY11		FY12		FY11	FY12
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	n
Statewide										
Total	882	9.9%	899	10.6%	500	5.6%	468	5.5%	8921	8488
PAF Age										
1. Child	33	1.2%	21	0.8%	29	1.1%	22	0.8%	2758	2779
2. TAY	230	9.4%	213	9.9%	177	7.2%	152	7.1%	2449	2152
3. Adult	560	17.5%	613	20.5%	271	8.5%	272	9.1%	3201	2995
4. Older Adult	59	11.5%	52	9.3%	23	4.5%	22	3.9%	513	562
Region										
Bay Area	113	12.2%	94	10.0%	63	6.8%	67	7.2%	927	936
Central	121	7.6%	123	7.8%	64	4.0%	64	4.1%	1586	1568
Los Angeles	277	14.8%	294	16.2%	142	7.6%	135	7.5%	1868	1810
Southern	309	7.6%	336	9.1%	196	4.8%	185	5.0%	4090	3703
Superior	62	13.8%	52	11.0%	35	7.8%	17	3.6%	450	471

Table A-7: Discharged Partners with a Residential Status of Homeless or Emergency Shelter at Admission who No Longer had a Residential Status of Homeless or Emergency Shelter at Discharge (but were not incarcerated) for 3.3 & 3.4

	FY-2010/2011			FY-2011/2012		
	Homeless or Emergency Shelter at Admission	Not Homeless or Emergency Shelter at Discharge (but not incarcerated)	% No Longer Homeless or in Emergency Shelter (but not incarcerated)	Homeless or Emergency Shelter at Admission	Not Homeless or Emergency Shelter at Discharge (but not incarcerated)	% No Longer Homeless or in Emergency Shelter (but not incarcerated)
Statewide						
Total	882	451	51.1%	899	450	50.1%
PAF Age						
2. TAY	230	95	41.3%	213	87	40.8%
3. Adult	560	298	53.2%	613	318	51.9%
4. Older Adult	59	42	71.2%	52	32	61.5%
Region						
Bay Area	113	53	46.9%	94	36	38.3%
Central	121	76	62.8%	123	78	63.4%
Los Angeles	277	150	54.2%	294	159	54.1%
Southern	309	140	45.3%	336	145	43.2%
Superior	62	32	51.6%	52	32	61.5%

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-8: Discharged Partners with a Primary Care Physician in the Past Year, Beginning, and at Discharge for 4.1 & 4.2

	FY-2010/2011				FY-2011/2012			
	Had Physician n %	Total Discharged with Complete Data n	Total Discharged n	Data Quality: Proportion of Data Used %	Had Physician n %	Total Discharged with Complete Data n	Total Discharged n	Data Quality: Proportion of Data Used %
Statewide								
Total	change 10.1%	6841	8921	76.7%	change 10.5%	6817	8488	80.3%
3M before Discharge	5278 77.2%				5397 79.2%			
Beginning	4586 67.0%				4681 68.7%			
Past Year	4631 67.7%				4744 69.6%			
PAF Age								
1. Child	change 5.2%	1993	2758	72.3%	change 3.5%	2236	2779	80.5%
3M before Discharge	1815 91.1%				2091 93.5%			
Beginning	1712 85.9%				2013 90.0%			
Past Year	1709 85.8%				2004 89.6%			
2. TAY	change 7.7%	1758	2449	71.8%	change 7.8%	1663	2152	77.3%
3M before Discharge	1131 64.3%				1129 67.9%			
Beginning	995 56.6%				1000 60.1%			
Past Year	1056 60.1%				1037 62.4%			
3. Adult	change 15.3%	2680	3201	83.7%	change 18.8%	2502	2995	83.5%
3M before Discharge	1954 72.9%				1799 71.9%			
Beginning	1544 57.6%				1328 53.1%			
Past Year	1544 57.6%				1362 54.4%			
4. Older Adult	change 10.5%	410	513	79.9%	change 9.1%	416	562	74.0%
3M before Discharge	378 92.2%				378 90.9%			
Beginning	335 81.7%				340 81.7%			
Past Year	322 78.5%				341 82.0%			
Region								
Bay Area	change 8.4%	713	927	76.9%	change 7.2%	724	936	77.4%
3M before Discharge	533 74.8%				544 75.1%			
Beginning	473 66.3%				492 68.0%			
Past Year	486 68.2%				507 70.0%			
Central	change 15.3%	1197	1586	75.5%	change 13.6%	1261	1568	80.4%
3M before Discharge	975 81.5%				1063 84.3%			
Beginning	792 66.2%				891 70.7%			
Past Year	804 67.2%				902 71.5%			
Los Angeles	change 11.1%	1571	1868	84.1%	change 10.9%	1550	1810	85.6%
3M before Discharge	1152 73.3%				1164 75.1%			
Beginning	977 62.2%				995 64.2%			
Past Year	947 60.3%				981 63.3%			
Southern	change 8.6%	3028	4090	74.0%	change 10.3%	2912	3703	78.6%
3M before Discharge	2342 77.3%				2316 79.5%			
Beginning	2082 68.8%				2015 69.2%			
Past Year	2132 70.4%				2065 70.9%			
Superior	change 4.2%	332	450	73.8%	change 5.9%	370	471	78.6%
3M before Discharge	276 83.1%				310 83.8%			
Beginning	262 78.9%				288 77.8%			
Past Year	262 78.9%				289 78.1%			

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-9: Discharged Partners with a Primary Care Physician in the Past Year, at the Beginning of Partnership and at Discharge for 4.3 & 4.4

County	FY-2010/2011				FY-2011/2012			
	Had Physician (Change is from Beginning to Discharge) n %	Total Discharged with Complete Data n	Total Discharged n	Data Quality: Proportion of Data Used %	Had Physician n %	Total Discharged with Complete Data n	Total Discharged n	Data Quality: Proportion of Data Used %
Amador	Change SN	3	10	30.0%	Change SN	3	13	23.1%
3M before Discharge	SN				SN	3	13	
Beginning	SN				SN	3	13	
Past Year	SN				SN			
Berkeley City	Change SN	0	0		Change SN	2	5	40.0%
3M before Discharge	SN				SN			
Beginning	SN				SN			
Past Year	SN				SN			
Butte	change 10.4%	48	82	58.5%	change 1.4%	73	104	70.2%
3M before Discharge	38 79.2%				55 75.3%			
Beginning	33 68.8%				54 74.0%			
Past Year	37 77.1%				55 75.3%			
Calaveras	Change SN	7	7	100.0%	change ALL	10	13	76.9%
3M before Discharge	SN				10 100.0%			
Beginning	SN				9 90.0%			
Past Year	SN				9 90.0%			
Colusa	Change SN	6	7	85.7%	Change SN	0	0	
3M before Discharge	SN				SN			
Beginning	SN				SN			
Past Year	SN				SN			
Contra Costa	change 7.7%	130	173	75.1%	change 6.8%	146	162	90.1%
3M before Discharge	82 63.1%				82 56.2%			
Beginning	72 55.4%				72 49.3%			
Past Year	72 55.4%				82 56.2%			
Del Norte	Change SN	5	5	100.0%	Change SN	0	0	
3M before Discharge	SN				SN			
Beginning	SN				SN			
Past Year	SN				SN			
El Dorado	change ALL	20	23	87.0%	change 8.8%	34	37	91.9%
3M before Discharge	20 100.0%				32 94.1%			
Beginning	17 85.0%				29 85.3%			
Past Year	16 80.0%				29 85.3%			
Fresno	change 28.8%	250	372	67.2%	change 20.0%	245	311	78.8%
3M before Discharge	201 80.4%				209 85.3%			
Beginning	129 51.6%				160 65.3%			
Past Year	135 54.0%				161 65.7%			
Glenn	change 8.8%	57	69	82.6%	change -3.3%	30	33	90.9%
3M before Discharge	53 93.0%				24 80.0%			
Beginning	48 84.2%				25 83.3%			
Past Year	49 86.0%				24 80.0%			
Humboldt	change -15.8%	19	21	90.5%	change 18.8%	16	18	88.9%
3M before Discharge	14 73.7%				15 93.8%			
Beginning	17 89.5%				12 75.0%			
Past Year	17 89.5%				14 87.5%			
Imperial	change 8.9%	203	257	79.0%	change 3.3%	183	228	80.3%
3M before Discharge	181 89.2%				158 86.3%			
Beginning	163 80.3%				152 83.1%			
Past Year	165 81.3%				154 84.2%			
Inyo	Change SN	3	9	33.3%	Change SN		5	0.0%
3M before Discharge	SN				SN		5	
Beginning	SN				SN		5	
Past Year	SN				SN			
Kern	change 11.9%	176	234	75.2%	change 5.5%	235	301	78.1%
3M before Discharge	114 64.8%				109 46.4%			
Beginning	93 52.8%				96 40.9%			
Past Year	94 53.4%				107 45.5%			
Kings	change -20.0%	10	64	15.6%	Change SN	2	68	2.9%
3M before Discharge	2 20.0%				SN			
Beginning	4 40.0%				SN			
Past Year	5 50.0%				SN			

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-9 (cont.): Discharged Partners with a Primary Care Physician in the Past Year, at the Beginning of Partnership and at Discharge for 4.3 & 4.4

County	FY-2010/2011				FY-2011/2012					
	Had Physician (Change is from Beginning to Discharge) n %		Total Discharged with Complete Data n	Total Discharged n	Data Quality: Proportion of Data Used %	Had Physician n %		Total Discharged with Complete Data n	Total Discharged n	Data Quality: Proportion of Data Used %
Lake	change	18.4%	38	42	90.5%	change	13.9%	36	42	85.7%
3M before Discharge	34	89.5%				33	91.7%			
Beginning	27	71.1%				28	77.8%			
Past Year	29	76.3%				29	80.6%			
Lassen	change	0.0%	10	11	90.9%	change	0.0%	11	12	91.7%
3M before Discharge	9	90.0%				9	81.8%			
Beginning	9	90.0%				9	81.8%			
Past Year	9	90.0%				10	90.9%			
Los Angeles	change	11.1%	1571	1868	84.1%	change	10.9%	1550	1810	85.6%
3M before Discharge	1152	73.3%				1164	75.1%			
Beginning	977	62.2%				995	64.2%			
Past Year	947	60.3%				981	63.3%			
Madera	change	8.5%	47	51	92.2%	change	22.9%	48	51	94.1%
3M before Discharge	37	78.7%				45	93.8%			
Beginning	33	70.2%				34	70.8%			
Past Year	33	70.2%				34	70.8%			
Mariposa	change	7.7%	13	19	68.4%	change	5.9%	17	18	94.4%
3M before Discharge	11	84.6%				15	88.2%			
Beginning	10	76.9%				14	82.4%			
Past Year	9	69.2%				14	82.4%			
Merced	change	1.7%	58	80	72.5%	change	6.1%	49	68	72.1%
3M before Discharge	54	93.1%				46	93.9%			
Beginning	53	91.4%				43	87.8%			
Past Year	54	93.1%				42	85.7%			
Modoc	Change	SN	6	13	46.2%	change	-8.7%	23	42	54.8%
3M before Discharge	SN					16	69.6%			
Beginning	SN					18	78.3%			
Past Year	SN					17	73.9%			
Mono	Change	SN	1	1	100.0%	Change	SN			#DIV/0!
3M before Discharge	SN					SN				
Beginning	SN					SN				
Past Year	SN					SN				
Napa	change	-6.9%	29	37	78.4%	change	16.7%	42	53	79.2%
3M before Discharge	24	82.8%				35	83.3%			
Beginning	26	89.7%				28	66.7%			
Past Year	26	89.7%				28	66.7%			
Nevada	change	0.0%	71	110	64.5%	change	11.4%	70	87	80.5%
3M before Discharge	56	78.9%				60	85.7%			
Beginning	56	78.9%				52	74.3%			
Past Year	54	76.1%				55	78.6%			
Orange	change	13.7%	415	481	86.3%	change	13.5%	430	514	83.7%
3M before Discharge	286	68.9%				307	71.4%			
Beginning	229	55.2%				249	57.9%			
Past Year	242	58.3%				274	63.7%			
Placer	change	21.7%	23	37	62.2%	change	4.8%	21	30	70.0%
3M before Discharge	21	91.3%				12	57.1%			
Beginning	16	69.6%				11	52.4%			
Past Year	16	69.6%				12	57.1%			
Plumas	change	0.0%	13	16	81.3%	Change	SN	5	5	100.0%
3M before Discharge	9	69.2%				SN				
Beginning	9	69.2%				SN				
Past Year	10	76.9%				SN				
Sacramento	change	9.0%	211	248	85.1%	change	12.8%	281	319	88.1%
3M before Discharge	166	78.7%				234	83.3%			
Beginning	147	69.7%				198	70.5%			
Past Year	153	72.5%				202	71.9%			
San Benito	change	5.6%	18	20	90.0%	change	-8.7%	23	25	92.0%
3M before Discharge	11	61.1%				13	56.5%			
Beginning	10	55.6%				15	65.2%			
Past Year	11	61.1%				15	65.2%			

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-9 (cont.): Discharged Partners with a Primary Care Physician in the Past Year, at the Beginning of Partnership and at Discharge for 4.3 & 4.4

County	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Had Physician (Change is from Beginning to Discharge) n %		Total Discharged with Complete Data n	Total Discharged n	Data Quality: Proportion of Data Used %	Had Physician n %		Total Discharged with Complete Data n	Total Discharged n	Data Quality: Proportion of Data Used %
San Bernardino	change	7.1%	496	938	52.9%	change	14.6%	499	671	74.4%
3M before Discharge	325	65.5%				347	69.5%			
Beginning	290	58.5%				274	54.9%			
Past Year	295	59.5%				274	54.9%			
San Diego	change	8.2%	1092	1392	78.4%	change	11.0%	1305	1670	78.1%
3M before Discharge	952	87.2%				1203	92.2%			
Beginning	863	79.0%				1060	81.2%			
Past Year	887	81.2%				1070	82.0%			
San Francisco	change	14.3%	189	237	79.7%	change	9.5%	220	259	84.9%
3M before Discharge	162	85.7%				193	87.7%			
Beginning	135	71.4%				172	78.2%			
Past Year	135	71.4%				167	75.9%			
San Joaquin	change	15.7%	274	334	82.0%	change	10.0%	289	337	85.8%
3M before Discharge	232	84.7%				236	81.7%			
Beginning	189	69.0%				207	71.6%			
Past Year	181	66.1%				208	72.0%			
San Luis Obispo	change	4.0%	99	119	83.2%	change	-5.7%	87	105	82.9%
3M before Discharge	85	85.9%				68	78.2%			
Beginning	81	81.8%				73	83.9%			
Past Year	80	80.8%				73	83.9%			
San Mateo	change	-13.9%	36	42	85.7%	change	-9.8%	41	53	77.4%
3M before Discharge	23	63.9%				27	65.9%			
Beginning	28	77.8%				31	75.6%			
Past Year	31	86.1%				35	85.4%			
Santa Clara	change	10.2%	215	284	75.7%	change	9.2%	206	302	68.2%
3M before Discharge	141	65.6%				152	73.8%			
Beginning	119	55.3%				133	64.6%			
Past Year	133	61.9%				138	67.0%			
Santa Cruz	change	ALL	10	33	30.3%	Change	SN	7	14	50.0%
3M before Discharge	10	100.0%				SN				
Beginning	8	80.0%				SN				
Past Year	8	80.0%				SN				
Shasta	change	-3.4%	29	36	80.6%	change	4.4%	45	49	91.8%
3M before Discharge	24	82.8%				37	82.2%			
Beginning	25	86.2%				35	77.8%			
Past Year	21	72.4%				33	73.3%			
Sierra	Change	SN	3	5	60.0%	Change	SN	7	9	77.8%
3M before Discharge	SN					SN				
Beginning	SN					SN				
Past Year	SN					SN				
Siskiyou	change	0.0%	18	22	81.8%	change	12.2%	49	62	79.0%
3M before Discharge	15	83.3%				47	95.9%			
Beginning	15	83.3%				41	83.7%			
Past Year	13	72.2%				39	79.6%			
Solano	change	5.8%	86	101	85.1%	change	2.7%	37	63	58.7%
3M before Discharge	80	93.0%				36	97.3%			
Beginning	75	87.2%				35	94.6%			
Past Year	70	81.4%				36	97.3%			
Stanislaus	change	12.9%	101	112	90.2%	change	22.2%	90	101	89.1%
3M before Discharge	69	68.3%				69	76.7%			
Beginning	56	55.4%				49	54.4%			
Past Year	59	58.4%				52	57.8%			
Sutter/Yuba	change	1.9%	53	66	80.3%	change	5.6%	54	59	91.5%
3M before Discharge	47	88.7%				50	92.6%			
Beginning	46	86.8%				47	87.0%			
Past Year	49	92.5%				48	88.9%			
Tehama	Change	SN	6	7	85.7%	Change	SN	2	5	40.0%
3M before Discharge	SN					SN				
Beginning	SN					SN				
Past Year	SN					SN				

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-9 (cont.): Discharged Partners with a Primary Care Physician in the Past Year, at the Beginning of Partnership and at Discharge for 4.3 & 4.4

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Had Physician (Change is from Beginning to Discharge)		Total Discharged with Complete Data	Total Discharged	Data Quality: Proportion of Data Used	Had Physician		Total Discharged with Complete Data	Total Discharged	Data Quality: Proportion of Data Used
	n	%	n	n	%	n	%	n	n	%
County										
Tri-City	change	20.0%	25	45	55.6%	change	3.3%	60	86	69.8%
3M before Discharge	13	52.0%				44	73.3%			
Beginning	8	32.0%				42	70.0%			
Past Year	8	32.0%				44	73.3%			
Trinity	Change	SN	3	4	75.0%	Change	SN	3	3	100.0%
3M before Discharge	SN					SN				
Beginning	SN					SN				
Past Year	SN					SN				
Tulare	change	19.3%	83	108	76.9%	change	7.8%	77	93	82.8%
3M before Discharge	69	83.1%				62	80.5%			
Beginning	53	63.9%				56	72.7%			
Past Year	54	65.1%				59	76.6%			
Tuolumne	Change	SN	6	6	100.0%	change	0.0%	14	15	93.3%
3M before Discharge	SN					13	92.9%			
Beginning	SN					13	92.9%			
Past Year	SN					9	64.3%			
Ventura	change	5.9%	522	624	83.7%	change	9.7%	113	128	88.3%
3M before Discharge	386	73.9%				80	70.8%			
Beginning	355	68.0%				69	61.1%			
Past Year	361	69.2%				69	61.1%			
Yolo	change	11.8%	34	39	87.2%	change	29.6%	27	30	90.0%
3M before Discharge	30	88.2%				26	96.3%			
Beginning	26	76.5%				18	66.7%			
Past Year	28	82.4%				19	70.4%			

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-10: Length of Retention in Service for Partners Admitted in FY for 5.1, 5.2 & 5.3

	FY-2009/2010		FY-2010/2011	
	Admitted		Admitted	
	n	% of Total Admitted	n	% of Total Admitted
Statewide				
All				
b) <3 Months	1050	8.0%	1025	8.9%
c) 3 Months to <6 Months	1417	11.0%	1349	12.4%
d) 6 Months to <1 Year	2164	16.8%	2022	18.5%
e) 1 Year+	8287	64.2%	6513	59.7%
Total Admitted	12918		10909	
PAF Age				
Adult				
b) <3 Months	280	4.9%	237	5.9%
c) 3 Months to <6 Months	368	6.6%	317	8.1%
d) 6 Months to <1 Year	695	12.4%	539	13.8%
e) 1 Year+	4258	76.0%	2822	72.1%
Total Admitted	5601		3915	
Child				
b) <3 Months	367	10.8%	420	10.9%
c) 3 Months to <6 Months	557	16.7%	550	15.7%
d) 6 Months to <1 Year	700	21.0%	796	22.7%
e) 1 Year+	1708	51.3%	1743	49.7%
Total Admitted	3332		3509	
Older Adult				
b) <3 Months	44	5.2%	37	4.4%
c) 3 Months to <6 Months	52	6.6%	68	8.6%
d) 6 Months to <1 Year	102	13.0%	131	16.6%
e) 1 Year+	587	74.8%	554	70.1%
Total Admitted	785		790	
TAY				
b) <3 Months	359	11.1%	331	12.0%
c) 3 Months to <6 Months	440	13.8%	414	15.4%
d) 6 Months to <1 Year	667	20.8%	556	20.6%
e) 1 Year+	1734	54.2%	1394	51.7%
Total Admitted	3200		2695	
Region				
Bay Area				
b) <3 Months	74	6.7%	94	7.7%
c) 3 Months to <6 Months	99	9.4%	138	12.0%
d) 6 Months to <1 Year	194	18.4%	205	17.8%
e) 1 Year+	686	65.1%	712	62.0%
Total Admitted	1053		1149	
Central				
b) <3 Months	204	6.9%	188	7.3%
c) 3 Months to <6 Months	249	8.5%	200	9.7%
d) 6 Months to <1 Year	481	16.5%	366	17.7%
e) 1 Year+	1979	67.9%	1318	63.6%
Total Admitted	2913		2072	
Los Angeles				
b) <3 Months	108	3.7%	100	3.8%
c) 3 Months to <6 Months	169	5.9%	180	6.8%
d) 6 Months to <1 Year	408	14.3%	405	15.2%
e) 1 Year+	2159	75.9%	1975	74.2%
Total Admitted	2844		2660	
Southern				
b) <3 Months	623	11.1%	586	12.9%
c) 3 Months to <6 Months	849	15.3%	758	17.0%
d) 6 Months to <1 Year	987	17.8%	952	21.4%
e) 1 Year+	3084	55.6%	2158	48.5%
Total Admitted	5543		4454	
Superior				
b) <3 Months	41	7.1%	57	9.8%
c) 3 Months to <6 Months	51	9.0%	73	12.7%
d) 6 Months to <1 Year	94	16.6%	94	16.4%
e) 1 Year+	379	67.1%	350	61.0%
Total Admitted	565		574	

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-11: Length of Retention in Service for Partners Admitted in FY by Region and Age Group for 5.4

	FY-2009/2010					FY-2010/2011				
	<3 Months		3 Months to <6		6 Months to <1 Year		1 Year+		Total Admitted	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Bay Area										
Child	23	8.9	24	9.3	62	23.9	150	57.9	259	
TAY	24	7.8	44	14.4	58	19.0	180	58.8	306	
Adult	23	5.9	28	7.2	67	17.1	273	69.8	391	
Older Adult	4	4.1	3	3.1	7	7.2	83	85.6	97	
Central										
Child	40	10.3	56	14.5	101	26.1	190	49.1	387	
TAY	41	7.9	49	9.5	108	20.9	318	61.6	516	
Adult	107	6.0	126	7.0	222	12.4	1336	74.6	1791	
Older Adult	16	7.3	18	8.2	50	22.8	135	61.6	219	
Los Angeles										
Child	44	3.5	83	6.7	215	17.3	898	72.4	1240	
TAY	24	4.2	36	6.3	73	12.8	437	76.7	570	
Adult	36	3.8	44	4.6	114	12.0	753	79.5	947	
Older Adult	4	4.6	6	6.9	6	6.9	71	81.6	87	
Southern										
Child	253	18.6	387	28.5	299	22.0	419	30.9	1358	
TAY	258	15.1	292	17.1	407	23.8	751	44.0	1708	
Adult	94	4.3	150	6.9	253	11.6	1688	77.3	2185	
Older Adult	18	6.2	20	6.8	28	9.6	226	77.4	292	
Superior										
Child	7	8.0	7	8.0	23	26.1	51	58.0	88	
TAY	12	12.0	19	19.0	21	21.0	48	48.0	100	
Adult	20	7.0	20	7.0	39	13.6	208	72.5	287	
Older Adult	2	2.2	5	5.6	11	12.2	72	80.0	90	

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-12: Length of Retention in Service for Child & TAY Partners Admitted in FY by County for 5.5 & 5.6

	FY-2009/2010				FY-2010/2011			
	<3 Months	3 Months to <6 Months	6+ Months	Total Admitted	<3 Months	3 Months to <6 Months	6+ Months	Total Admitted
	n	n	n %	n	n	n	n %	n
Amador			SN	SN			SN	SN
Berkeley City			SN	SN			SN	SN
Butte	1	5	16 72.7%	22	16	26	77 64.7%	119
Calaveras			SN	SN			SN	SN
Colusa			SN	SN			SN	SN
Contra Costa	12	4	79 83.2%	95	8	10	72 80.0%	90
Del Norte			SN	SN			SN	SN
El Dorado	3	1	8 66.7%	12		3	15 83.3%	18
Fresno	16	39	207 79.0%	262	58	34	156 62.9%	248
Glenn	3	4	22 75.9%	29	5	9	10 41.7%	24
Humboldt			SN	SN			SN	SN
Imperial	17	28	148 76.7%	193	26	22	118 71.1%	166
Inyo			SN	SN			50.0%	SN
Kern	13	16	81 73.6%	110	14	28	82 SN	124
Kings	4	6	12 54.5%	22	7	9	17 51.5%	33
Lake	3	4	9 56.3%	16	1	3	7 63.6%	11
Lassen			SN	SN			SN	SN
Los Angeles	68	119	1623 89.7%	1810	64	114	1457 89.1%	1635
Madera	3	6	27 75.0%	36	1	2	34 91.9%	37
Mariposa	2	3	4 SN	SN	1	2	13 81.3%	16
Merced	7	3	46 82.1%	56	6	10	21 56.8%	37
Modoc			SN	SN	1	1	8 80.0%	10
Mono			SN	SN			SN	SN
Napa		2	14 87.5%	16	1	6	18 72.0%	25
Nevada	8	10	57 76.0%	75	13	8	66 75.9%	87
Orange	31	46	227 74.7%	304	43	27	274 79.7%	344
Placer	1		15 93.8%	16	3	3	19 76.0%	25
Plumas			SN	SN			SN	SN
Sacramento	10	5	90 85.7%	105	5	19	147 86.0%	171
San Benito		2	15 88.2%	17		3	8 72.7%	11
San Bernardino	203	275	505 51.4%	983	132	163	347 54.0%	642
San Diego	205	253	556 54.8%	1014	183	296	651 57.6%	1130
San Francisco	18	26	124 73.8%	168	18	28	130 73.9%	176
San Joaquin	24	16	140 77.8%	180	39	11	112 69.1%	162
San Luis Obispo	8	16	77 76.2%	101	10	14	56 70.0%	80
San Mateo	1	4	38 88.4%	43	3	10	42 76.4%	55
Santa Clara	15	26	88 68.2%	129	17	14	96 75.6%	127
Santa Cruz			SN	SN	1	16	21 55.3%	38
Shasta			SN	SN			SN	SN
Sierra			SN	SN			SN	SN
Siskiyou			SN	SN			SN	SN
Solano	1	4	33 86.8%	38	3	6	22 71.0%	31
Sonoma			59 100.0%	59			43 100.0%	43
Stanislaus	3	6	57 86.4%	66	1	8	32 78.0%	41
Sutter/Yuba	4	5	53 85.5%	62	5	6	48 81.4%	59
Tehama			SN	SN			SN	SN
Tri-City	3		9 75.0%	12	6	12	73 80.2%	91
Trinity			SN	SN			SN	SN
Tulare	3	13	40 71.4%	56	3	10	27 67.5%	40
Tuolumne			SN	SN			SN	SN
Ventura	31	45	273 78.2%	349	52	25	102 57.0%	179
Yolo			SN	SN			11 100.0%	11

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-13: Length of Retention in Service for Adult and Older Adult Partners Admitted in FY by County for 5.7 & 5.8

	FY-2009/2010						FY-2010/2011					
	<3	3 Months	6 Months			Total	<3	3 Months	6 Months			Total
	Months n	to <6 Months n	to <1 Year n	1 Year+ n	%	n	Months n	to <6 Months n	to <1 Year n	1 Year+ n	%	n
Amador		3	4	23	76.7%	30	1			10	90.9%	11
Berkeley City						SN				16	100.0%	16
Butte	3	1	5	102	91.9%	111	2	1	3	69	92.0%	75
Calaveras						SN						SN
Colusa						SN						SN
Contra Costa	3	4	10	35	67.3%	52	5	9	6	32	61.5%	52
Del Norte						SN						SN
El Dorado	3		10	12	48.0%	25	1	1	5	15	68.2%	22
Fresno	8	5	21	65	65.7%	99	10	12	20	113	72.9%	155
Glenn	1	4	5	18	64.3%	28	3	7	10	15	42.9%	35
Humboldt	2		3	31	86.1%	36	2	1	1	20	83.3%	24
Imperial	6	18	20	74	62.7%	118	23	18	24	27	29.3%	92
Inyo	2	2	2	7	53.8%	13	1	1	2	4	SN	SN
Kern	11	15	26	88	62.9%	140	17	25	36	82	51.3%	160
Kings	9	17	10	6	14.3%	42	6	6	11	4	14.8%	27
Lake	5	8	11	26	52.0%	50	3		3	16	72.7%	22
Lassen						SN						SN
Los Angeles	40	50	120	824	79.7%	1034	36	66	123	800	78.0%	1025
Madera	16	17	13	23	33.3%	69		3	5	19	70.4%	27
Mariposa						SN						SN
Merced						SN		1		14	93.3%	15
Modoc	1	5	1	3	30.0%	10	2	2	6	19	65.5%	29
Mono						SN						SN
Napa		1	5	15	71.4%	21	2	1	6	6	40.0%	15
Nevada	1	1	4	19	76.0%	25	1	1	3	13	72.2%	18
Orange	14	19	17	158	76.0%	208	22	19	22	163	72.1%	226
Placer		2	2	25	86.2%	29		3	2	17	77.3%	22
Plumas	1	2	2	12	70.6%	17						SN
Sacramento	49	52	117	654	75.0%	872	7	12	23	165	79.7%	207
San Benito		3	3	5	45.5%	11						SN
San Bernardino	23	31	57	263	70.3%	374	13	38	45	189	66.3%	285
San Diego	31	52	91	632	78.4%	806	32	52	119	538	72.6%	741
San Francisco	4	8	13	65	72.2%	90	9	9	23	181	81.5%	222
San Joaquin	13	18	59	513	85.1%	603	14	21	67	355	77.7%	457
San Luis Obispo	1	7	13	20	48.8%	41	5	3	7	11	42.3%	26
Santa Clara	16	12	25	115	68.5%	168	22	17	27	99	60.0%	165
Santa Cruz						SN	1	5		23	79.3%	29
Shasta	3	2	10	30	66.7%	45	2	1	4	13	65.0%	20
Sierra						SN						SN
Siskiyou	4		5	13	59.1%	22	1	1	8	18	64.3%	28
Solano	4	3	18	43	63.2%	68	2	3		6	54.5%	11
Sonoma				76	100.0%	76				28	100.0%	28
Stanislaus	7	5	18	53	63.9%	83	6	6	9	54	72.0%	75
Sutter/Yuba		2	2	17	81.0%	21				14	100.0%	14
Tehama		1		11	91.7%	12						SN
Tri-City						SN	3	10	10	62	72.9%	85
Trinity						SN						SN
Tulare	13	16	10	45	53.6%	84	10	12	16	38	50.0%	76
Tuolumne						SN						SN
Ventura	25	27	55	677	86.4%	784	5	6	14	58	69.9%	83
Yolo	3	2	3	13	61.9%	21	2	3		24	82.8%	29

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-14: Attendance for Child Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY for 6.1 & 6.2

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Beginning Attendance Always or Most of the Time n %	1 Year Attendance Always or Most of the Time n %	1 Year Attendance Always or Most of the Time or Improved n %	Total with Complete Data n %	Total Served 1 Year n	Beginning Attendance Always or Most of the Time n %	1 Year Attendance Always or Most of the Time n %	1 Year Attendance Always or Most of the Time or Improved n %	Total with Complete Data n %	Total Served 1 Year n
Statewide										
Totals	881 82.4	922 86.2	941 88.0	1069 62.6	1708	918 80.2	986 86.1	1003 87.6	1145 65.7	1743
Region										
Bay Area	92 80.7	90 78.9	96 84.2	114 76.0	150	90 78.3	99 86.1	101 87.8	115 71.0	162
Central	85 72.6	94 80.3	98 83.8	117 61.6	190	103 71.5	119 82.6	122 84.7	144 73.8	195
Los Angeles	431 81.9	463 88.0	471 89.5	526 58.6	898	409 79.1	447 86.5	456 88.2	517 62.6	826
Southern	242 88.3	238 86.9	239 87.2	274 65.4	419	270 84.4	276 86.2	279 87.2	320 67.7	473
Superior	31 81.6	37 97.4	37 97.4	38 74.5	51	46 93.9	45 91.8	45 91.8	49 56.3	87

Table A-15: Grades for Child Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY for 6.3 & 6.4

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Beginning Grades Good or Very Good n %	1 Year Grades Good or Very Good n %	1 Year Grades Good or Very Good or Improved n %	Total with Complete Data n %	Total Served 1 Year n	Beginning Grades Good or Very Good n %	1 Year Grades Good or Very Good n %	1 Year Grades Good or Very Good or Improved n %	Total with Complete Data n %	Total Served 1 Year n
Statewide										
Totals	228 21.8	310 29.7	506 48.5	1069 62.6	1708	244 21.5	311 27.4	529 46.7	1145 65.7	1743
Region										
Bay Area	24 21.1	31 27.2	56 49.1	114 76.0	150	17 14.9	25 21.9	46 40.4	114 70.4	162
Central	26 23.2	33 29.5	53 47.3	112 58.9	190	37 25.5	41 28.3	63 43.4	145 74.4	195
Los Angeles	97 19.1	160 31.4	256 50.3	509 56.7	898	87 17.2	127 25.0	250 49.3	507 61.4	826
Southern	70 25.8	76 28.0	126 46.5	271 64.7	419	85 26.6	103 32.2	152 47.5	320 67.7	473
Superior	11 28.9	10 26.3	15 39.5	38 74.5	51	18 38.3	15 31.9	18 38.3	47 54.0	87

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-16: Employment for Partners with Employment Goals Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY for 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 & 7.4

	FY-2010/2011							FY-2011/2012						
	Any Employment at Start		Attempted Any New Employment During Year 1		Total Partners with Goals		Total Partners Reaching 1 Yr	Any Employment at Start		Attempted Any New Employment During Year 1		Total Partners with Goals		Total Partners Reaching 1 Yr
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Statewide														
Totals	250	10.6	249	10.6	2359	28.5%	8287	147	7.4	211	10.7	1974	30.3%	6513
PAF Age														
1. Child	1	2.9	2	5.7	35	2.0%	1708	1	1.4	1	1.4	70	4.0%	1743
2. TAY	86	8.5	156	15.4	1012	58.4%	1734	57	7.5	110	14.4	765	54.9%	1394
3. Adult	154	12.4	90	7.2	1246	29.3%	4258	81	7.6	96	9.0	1064	37.7%	2822
4. Older Adult	9	13.6	1	1.5	66	11.2%	587	8	10.7	4	5.3	75	13.5%	554
Region														
Bay Area	18	7.9	39	17.2	227	33.1%	686	20	7.2	44	15.9	276	38.8%	712
Central	62	13.1	30	6.3	473	23.9%	1979	41	9.0	33	7.2	458	34.7%	1318
Los Angeles	23	4.7			494	22.9%	2159	19	4.2			456	23.1%	1975
Southern	134	12.6	169	15.8	1067	34.6%	3084	53	7.5	127	17.9	710	32.9%	2158
Superior	13	13.3	11	11.2	98	25.9%	379	14	18.9	7	9.5	74	21.1%	350

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-17: Arrests for TAY, Adult and Older Adult Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY (excludes counties not meeting data quality threshold) for 8.1 & 8.2

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Partners with Arrests		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality		Partners with Arrests		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality	
	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET
Statewide										
Totals										
1 Year Before	1057	21.7	4870			950	23.7	4004		
Year 1 During	202	4.1	4870	85.3	91.3	186	4.6	4004	83.6	86.2
PAF Age										
2. TAY										
1 Year Before	388	30.4	1278			314	27.7	1132		
Year 1 During	65	5.1	1278	78.7	85.8	91	8.0	1132	81.9	84.5
3. Adult										
1 Year Before	644	20.2	3188			597	25.0	2390		
Year 1 During	131	4.1	3188	88.2	93.3	91	3.8	2390	86.4	86.8
4. Older Adult										
1 Year Before	25	6.2	404			39	8.1	482		
Year 1 During	6	1.5	404	82.9	92.8	4	0.8	482	73.5	87.6
Region										
Bay Area										
1 Year Before	159	37.7	422			160	31.9	502		
Year 1 During	26	6.2	422	86.1	97.4	31	6.2	502	89.9	93.2
Central										
1 Year Before	260	15.3	1702			213	20.3	1047		
Year 1 During	67	3.9	1702	91.7	96.4	43	4.1	1047	90.8	88.8
Los Angeles										
1 Year Before	290	23.0	1260			233	20.3	1149		
Year 1 During	31	2.5	1260	72.8	75.2	31	2.7	1149	77.8	70.1
Southern										
1 Year Before	315	23.6	1333			307	26.1	1175		
Year 1 During	65	4.9	1333	87.6	97.4	63	5.4	1175	79.4	96.3
Superior										
1 Year Before	33	21.6	153			37	28.2	131		
Year 1 During	13	8.5	153	94.0	95.4	18	13.7	131	89.3	89.3

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-18: Arrests for TAY, Adult and Older Adult Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY for 8.3 & 8.4

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Partners with Arrests		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality		Partners with Arrests		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality	
	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET
Amador	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			27					14		
Year 1 During			27	6.5	88.9			14	0.0	100.0
Berkeley City	(Change)	DC				(Change)	0.0			
1 Year Before			2			2	8.7	23		
Year 1 During			2	100.0	100.0	2	8.7	23	94.6	87.0
Butte	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			113					86		
Year 1 During			113	23.0	90.3			86	62.5	100.0
Calaveras	(Change)	DC				(Change)	DC			
1 Year Before			3					8		
Year 1 During			3	100.0	100.0			8	100.0	100.0
Colusa	(Change)	NS				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			0					1		
Year 1 During			0					1	0.0	0.0
Contra Costa	(Change)	-22.4				(Change)	-8.1			
1 Year Before	20	29.9	67			8	16.3	49		
Year 1 During	5	7.5	67	84.7	100.0	4	8.2	49	100.0	98.0
Del Norte	(Change)	DC				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			5					3		
Year 1 During			5	95.0	80.0			3	33.3	33.3
El Dorado	(Change)	ALL				(Change)	-42.1			
1 Year Before	1	6.7	15			9	47.4	19		
Year 1 During	0	0.0	15	93.3	100.0	1	5.3	19	97.4	94.7
Fresno	(Change)	-27.6				(Change)	-27.3			
1 Year Before	38	30.9	123			43	27.9	154		
Year 1 During	4	3.3	123	81.1	91.9	1	0.6	154	90.4	93.5
Glenn	(Change)	0.0				(Change)	-25.0			
1 Year Before	4	18.2	22			7	35.0	20		
Year 1 During	4	18.2	22	95.5	95.5	2	10.0	20	96.2	90.0
Humboldt	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	ALL			
1 Year Before			34			5	22.7	22		
Year 1 During			34	66.2	97.1	0	0.0	22	80.7	77.3
Imperial	(Change)	-28.8				(Change)	-21.0			
1 Year Before	43	36.4	118			21	27.6	76		
Year 1 During	9	7.6	118	91.7	96.6	5	6.6	76	88.2	96.1
Inyo	(Change)	ALL				(Change)	DC			
1 Year Before	3	30.0	10					4		
Year 1 During	0	0.0	10	97.5	80.0			4	93.8	75.0
Kern	(Change)	-22.7				(Change)	-33.6			
1 Year Before	31	23.5	132			46	35.9	128		
Year 1 During	1	0.8	132	74.2	100.0	3	2.3	128	79.7	98.4
Kings	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			7					5		
Year 1 During			7	10.7	100.0			5	20.0	100.0
Lake	(Change)	-17.3				(Change)	-11.1			
1 Year Before	6	20.7	29			4	22.2	18		
Year 1 During	1	3.4	29	98.3	100.0	2	11.1	18	97.2	100.0
Lassen	(Change)	NS				(Change)	DC			
1 Year Before			4					5		
Year 1 During			4	100.0	100.0			5	100.0	100.0
Los Angeles	(Change)	-20.5				(Change)	-17.6			
1 Year Before	290	23.0	1260			233	20.3	1149		
Year 1 During	31	2.5	1260	72.8	75.2	31	2.7	1149	77.8	70.1
Madera	(Change)	ALL				(Change)	-20.7			
1 Year Before	5	15.6	32			7	24.1	29		
Year 1 During	0	0.0	32	80.5	87.5	1	3.4	29	95.7	86.2

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-18 (cont.): Arrests for TAY, Adult and Older Adult Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY for 8.3 & 8.4

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Partners with Arrests		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality		Partners with Arrests		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality	
	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET
Mariposa	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			1					5		
Year 1 During			1	50.0	100.0			5	40.0	80.0
Merced	(Change)	-28.6				(Change)	-12.6			
1 Year Before	5	35.7	14			3	18.8	16		
Year 1 During	1	7.1	14	91.1	100.0	1	6.2	16	90.6	93.8
Modoc	(Change)	NS				(Change)	ALL			
1 Year Before			5			1	4.5	22		
Year 1 During			5	85.0	100.0	0	0.0	22	71.6	90.9
Mono	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			1					1		
Year 1 During			1	50.0	0.0			1	50.0	100.0
Napa	(Change)	0.0				(Change)	-23.1			
1 Year Before	3	15.0	20			5	38.5	13		
Year 1 During	3	15.0	20	80.0	100.0	2	15.4	13	84.6	100.0
Nevada	(Change)	-17.9				(Change)	-6.9			
1 Year Before	12	42.9	28			10	34.5	29		
Year 1 During	7	25.0	28	99.1	92.9	8	27.6	29	87.9	79.3
Orange	(Change)	-34.2				(Change)	-28.8			
1 Year Before	108	41.5	260			113	40.1	282		
Year 1 During	19	7.3	260	85.1	98.1	32	11.3	282	88.8	95.7
Placer	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			32					23		
Year 1 During			32	66.4	96.9			23	46.7	95.7
Plumas	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			13					4		
Year 1 During			13	67.3	76.9			4	37.5	100.0
Sacramento	(Change)	-5.7				(Change)	-10.8			
1 Year Before	74	10.7	694			43	20.1	214		
Year 1 During	35	5.0	694	90.0	97.8	20	9.3	214	81.3	94.4
San Benito	(Change)	ALL				(Change)	DC			
1 Year Before	1	9.1	11					2		
Year 1 During	0	0.0	11	100.0	100.0			2	75.0	100.0
San Bernardino	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			441					311		
Year 1 During			441	33.0	73.0			311	59.0	64.3
San Diego	(Change)	-10.8				(Change)	-14.9			
1 Year Before	113	14.4	786			120	17.9	672		
Year 1 During	28	3.6	786	89.9	96.8	20	3.0	672	74.1	96.1
San Francisco	(Change)	-24.2				(Change)	-29.4			
1 Year Before	30	31.6	95			76	35.5	214		
Year 1 During	7	7.4	95	88.9	98.9	13	6.1	214	94.4	93.5
San Joaquin	(Change)	-11.0				(Change)	-9.4			
1 Year Before	82	13.5	609			46	10.8	425		
Year 1 During	15	2.5	609	96.7	95.1	6	1.4	425	95.2	82.8
San Luis Obispo	(Change)	-32.5				(Change)	-23.6			
1 Year Before	20	54.1	37			7	41.2	17		
Year 1 During	8	21.6	37	91.2	100.0	3	17.6	17	95.6	100.0
San Mateo	(Change)	ALL				(Change)	-10.6			
1 Year Before	7	31.8	22			4	21.1	19		
Year 1 During	0	0.0	22	100.0	86.4	2	10.5	19	97.4	89.5

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-18 (cont.): Arrests for TAY, Adult and Older Adult Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY for 8.3 & 8.4

	FY-2010/2011						FY-2011/2012					
	Partners with Arrests		Total	Data Quality			Partners with Arrests		Total	Data Quality		
	n	%	Partners with Data n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET		n	%	Partners with Data n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET	
Santa Clara	(Change)	-42.5					(Change)	-37.2				
1 Year Before	73	49.3	148				53	41.1	129			
Year 1 During	10	6.8	148	77.7	96.6		5	3.9	129	81.2	95.3	
Santa Cruz	(Change)	NS					(Change)	-6.8				
1 Year Before			0				6	13.6	44			
Year 1 During			0				3	6.8	44	83.5	86.4	
Shasta	(Change)	-9.1					(Change)	-25.0				
1 Year Before	4	12.1	33				8	50.0	16			
Year 1 During	1	3.0	33	97.0	100.0		4	25.0	16	98.4	100.0	
Sierra	(Change)	LQ					(Change)	NS				
1 Year Before			3						1			
Year 1 During			3	58.3	100.0				1	100.0	100.0	
Siskiyou	(Change)	ALL					(Change)	0.0				
1 Year Before	2	14.3	14				1	5.3	19			
Year 1 During	0	0.0	14	91.1	100.0		1	5.3	19	75.0	94.7	
Solano	(Change)	-40.3					(Change)	LQ				
1 Year Before	24	42.1	57						9			
Year 1 During	1	1.8	57	98.7	96.5				9	69.4	77.8	
Sonoma	(Change)	LQ					(Change)	LQ				
1 Year Before			103						41			
Year 1 During			103	70.4	57.3				41	33.5	61.0	
Stanislaus	(Change)	-11.5					(Change)	-10.9				
1 Year Before	17	21.8	78				16	21.9	73			
Year 1 During	8	10.3	78	92.6	100.0		8	11.0	73	92.5	93.2	
Sutter/Yuba	(Change)	-13.4					(Change)	ALL				
1 Year Before	5	16.7	30				11	45.8	24			
Year 1 During	1	3.3	30	97.5	100.0		0	0.0	24	94.8	100.0	
Tehama	(Change)	LQ					(Change)	LQ				
1 Year Before			13						3			
Year 1 During			13	53.8	53.8				3	41.7	33.3	
Tri-City	(Change)	NS					(Change)	LQ				
1 Year Before			3						77			
Year 1 During			3	83.3	100.0				77	82.5	64.9	
Trinity	(Change)	LQ					(Change)	NS				
1 Year Before			6						1			
Year 1 During			6	100.0	33.3				1	100.0	100.0	
Tulare	(Change)	ALL					(Change)	-41.8				
1 Year Before	26	34.7	75				26	47.3	55			
Year 1 During	0	0.0	75	85.7	100.0		3	5.5	55	84.1	87.3	
Tuolumne	(Change)	NC					(Change)	LQ				
1 Year Before			5						1			
Year 1 During			5	85.0	100.0				1	50.0	100.0	
Ventura	(Change)	LQ					(Change)	LQ				
1 Year Before			871						105			
Year 1 During			871	90.9	68.4				105	62.4	60.0	
Yolo	(Change)	7.7					(Change)	-6.6				
1 Year Before	1	7.7	13				4	13.3	30			
Year 1 During	2	15.4	13	86.5	100.0		2	6.7	30	93.3	86.7	

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-19: Incarcerations for TAY, Adult and Older Adult Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY (excludes counties not meeting data quality threshold) for 9.1 & 9.2

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Partners with Incarcerations		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality		Partners with Incarcerations		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality	
	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET
Statewide										
Totals										
1 Year Before	921	18.1	5079			848	20.1	4209		
Year 1 During	616	12.1	5079	85.1	91.5	571	13.6	4209	83.4	86.7
PAF Age										
2. TAY										
1 Year Before	338	24.5	1379			289	23.5	1231		
Year 1 During	250	18.1	1379	79.0	86.7	239	19.4	1231	81.8	85.4
3. Adult										
1 Year Before	561	17.1	3289			534	21.4	2490		
Year 1 During	354	10.8	3289	87.9	93.4	313	12.6	2490	86.0	87.1
4. Older Adult										
1 Year Before	22	5.4	411			25	5.1	488		
Year 1 During	12	2.9	411	82.5	92.9	19	3.9	488	73.6	87.7
Region										
Bay Area										
1 Year Before	172	36.1	477			174	32.0	544		
Year 1 During	111	23.3	477	85.4	96.9	115	21.1	544	88.9	93.4
Central										
1 Year Before	211	12.1	1748			166	15.1	1101		
Year 1 During	148	8.5	1748	91.5	96.5	105	9.5	1101	90.1	89.1
Los Angeles										
1 Year Before	215	16.7	1287			168	14.4	1170		
Year 1 During	111	8.6	1287	72.9	75.7	120	10.3	1170	77.9	70.7
Southern										
1 Year Before	299	21.3	1407			309	24.6	1257		
Year 1 During	222	15.8	1407	87.2	97.5	210	16.7	1257	79.6	96.3
Superior										
1 Year Before	24	15.0	160			31	22.6	137		
Year 1 During	24	15.0	160	93.6	95.6	21	15.3	137	87.6	88.3

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-20: Incarcerations for TAY, Adult and Older Adult Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service by County in FY for 9.3 & 9.4

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Partners with Incarceration		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality		Partners with Incarceration		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality	
	n	%		% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET	n	%		% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET
Amador	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			29					14		
Year 1 During			29	6.3	89.7			14	0	100
Berkeley City	(Change)	DC				(Change)	0			
1 Year Before			2			2	8.7	23		
Year 1 During			2	100	100	2	8.7	23	94.6	87
Butte	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			114					87		
Year 1 During			114	23	90.4			87	62.3	100
Calaveras	(Change)	DC				(Change)	DC			
1 Year Before			3					8		
Year 1 During			3	100	100			8	100	100
Colusa	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			1					1		
Year 1 During			1	0	0			1	0	0
Contra Costa	(Change)	-8.4				(Change)	1.9			
1 Year Before	21	29.2	72			10	18.5	54		
Year 1 During	15	20.8	72	84.6	100	11	20.4	54	99.5	98.1
Del Norte	(Change)	DC				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			5					3		
Year 1 During			5	95	80			3	33.3	33.3
El Dorado	(Change)	0				(Change)	-31.6			
1 Year Before	2	13.3	15			9	47.4	19		
Year 1 During	2	13.3	15	93.3	100	3	15.8	19	97.4	94.7
Fresno	(Change)	-2.2				(Change)	-1.2			
1 Year Before	29	21.6	134			20	11.6	173		
Year 1 During	26	19.4	134	81	92.5	18	10.4	173	88.5	93.6
Glenn	(Change)	4.3				(Change)	-14.3			
1 Year Before	4	17.4	23			6	28.6	21		
Year 1 During	5	21.7	23	96.6	95.7	3	14.3	21	96.2	90.5
Humboldt	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	ALL			
1 Year Before			35			3	12	25		
Year 1 During			35	66.2	97.1	0	0	25	71	72
Imperial	(Change)	3.4				(Change)	5.6			
1 Year Before	42	28.8	146			16	18	89		
Year 1 During	47	32.2	146	91.1	97.3	21	23.6	89	89	96.6
Inyo	(Change)	0				(Change)	NS			
1 Year Before	2	18.2	11					4		
Year 1 During	2	18.2	11	100	81.8			4	93.8	75
Kern	(Change)	-17				(Change)	-21.3			
1 Year Before	32	23.7	135			48	35.3	136		
Year 1 During	9	6.7	135	73.6	100	19	14	136	79.9	98.5
Kings	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			8					5		
Year 1 During			8	9.4	100			5	20	100
Lake	(Change)	-9.7				(Change)	-11.1			
1 Year Before	7	22.6	31			4	22.2	18		
Year 1 During	4	12.9	31	98.3	100	2	11.1	18	97.2	100
Lassen	(Change)	NC				(Change)	DC			
1 Year Before			5					5		
Year 1 During			5	100	100			5	100	100
Los Angeles	(Change)	-8.1				(Change)	-4.1			
1 Year Before	215	16.7	1287			168	14.4	1170		
Year 1 During	111	8.6	1287	72.9	75.7	120	10.3	1170	77.9	70.7
Madera	(Change)	-6.3				(Change)	-13.8			
1 Year Before	3	9.4	32			6	20.7	29		
Year 1 During	1	3.1	32	80.5	87.5	2	6.9	29	95.7	86.2

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-20 (cont.): Incarcerations for TAY, Adult and Older Adult Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service by County in FY for 9.3 & 9.4

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Partners with Incarceration n %	Total Partners with Data n	Data Quality % 3Ms in Year 1 % with a KET			Partners with Incarceration n %	Total Partners with Data n	Data Quality % 3Ms in Year 1 % with a KET		
Mariposa	(Change) LQ					(Change) LQ				
1 Year Before		1					5			
Year 1 During		1	50	100			5	40	80	
Merced	(Change) 7.2					(Change) -6.3				
1 Year Before	1 7.1	14				3 18.8	16			
Year 1 During	2 14.3	14	91.1	100		2 12.5	16	90.6	93.8	
Modoc	(Change) SN					(Change) LQ				
1 Year Before		5					24			
Year 1 During		5	85	100			24	69.1	91.7	
Mono	(Change) LQ					(Change) LQ				
1 Year Before		1					1			
Year 1 During		1	50	0			1	50	100	
Napa	(Change) 0					(Change) -7.2				
1 Year Before	3 15	20				4 28.6	14			
Year 1 During	3 15	20	80	100		3 21.4	14	83	100	
Nevada	(Change) 9.7					(Change) 3.5				
1 Year Before	9 29	31				9 31	29			
Year 1 During	12 38.7	31	95.8	93.5		10 34.5	29	87.9	79.3	
Orange	(Change) -14.8					(Change) -9.8				
1 Year Before	113 39.9	283				117 38.2	306			
Year 1 During	71 25.1	283	84	97.9		87 28.4	306	88.6	96.1	
Placer	(Change) LQ					(Change) LQ				
1 Year Before		33					23			
Year 1 During		33	66.4	97			23	46.7	95.7	
Plumas	(Change) LQ					(Change) LQ				
1 Year Before		13					6			
Year 1 During		13	67.3	76.9			6	25	66.7	
Sacramento	(Change) -1.6					(Change) -3.4				
1 Year Before	61 8.6	711				45 19.3	233			
Year 1 During	50 7	711	89.6	97.9		37 15.9	233	81.5	94.8	
San Benito	(Change) 0					(Change) NC				
1 Year Before	1 8.3	12					3			
Year 1 During	1 8.3	12	100	100			3	80	100	
San Bernardino	(Change) LQ					(Change) LQ				
1 Year Before		498					335			
Year 1 During		498	33.2	76.1			335	59.6	66.9	
San Diego	(Change) -1					(Change) -5.8				
1 Year Before	91 11.3	804				117 16.6	705			
Year 1 During	83 10.3	804	89.7	96.9		76 10.8	705	74.3	95.9	
San Francisco	(Change) -7.9					(Change) -14.8				
1 Year Before	23 22.8	101				78 35.1	222			
Year 1 During	15 14.9	101	88.7	99		45 20.3	222	94.5	93.7	
San Joaquin	(Change) -6.1					(Change) -6.6				
1 Year Before	63 10.2	615				38 8.9	428			
Year 1 During	25 4.1	615	96.8	95.1		10 2.3	428	95	82.7	
San Luis Obispo	(Change) -23					(Change) -19.1				
1 Year Before	21 53.8	39				11 52.4	21			
Year 1 During	12 30.8	39	90.8	100		7 33.3	21	93.2	100	
San Mateo	(Change) 16					(Change) -4.8				
1 Year Before	3 12	25				6 28.6	21			
Year 1 During	7 28	25	100	88		5 23.8	21	98.7	90.5	

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-20 (cont.): Incarcerations for TAY, Adult and Older Adult Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service by County in FY for 9.3 & 9.4

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Partners with Incarceration		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality		Partners with Incarceration		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality	
	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET
Santa Clara	(Change)	-19.2				(Change)	-14.3			
1 Year Before	99	52.9	187			64	41.8	153		
Year 1 During	63	33.7	187	76.5	95.7	42	27.5	153	78.6	94.8
Santa Cruz	(Change)	NS				(Change)	-2.3			
1 Year Before			0			4	9.1	44		
Year 1 During			0			3	6.8	44	83.5	86.4
Shasta	(Change)	6.1				(Change)	-11.8			
1 Year Before	0	0	33			5	29.4	17		
Year 1 During	2	6.1	33	97	100	3	17.6	17	98.5	100
Sierra	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	NS			
1 Year Before			3					1		
Year 1 During			3	58.3	100			1	100	100
Siskiyou	(Change)	ALL				(Change)	0			
1 Year Before	1	7.1	14			2	10	20		
Year 1 During	0	0	14	91.1	100	2	10	20	76.9	95
Solano	(Change)	-24.1				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before	21	36.2	58					10		
Year 1 During	7	12.1	58	98.7	94.8			10	62.5	80
Sonoma	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			103					41		
Year 1 During			103	70.4	57.3			41	33.5	61
Stanislaus	(Change)	-3.6				(Change)	-2.6			
1 Year Before	22	26.8	82			14	18.4	76		
Year 1 During	19	23.2	82	92.7	100	12	15.8	76	92.6	93.4
Sutter/Yuba	(Change)	0				(Change)	-16			
1 Year Before	2	6.5	31			7	28	25		
Year 1 During	2	6.5	31	100	100	3	12	25	94.9	100
Tehama	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			18					10		
Year 1 During			18	44.4	50			10	35	40
Tri-City	(Change)	NS				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			3					81		
Year 1 During			3	83.3	100			81	83.2	65.4
Trinity	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	NS			
1 Year Before			6					1		
Year 1 During			6	100	33.3			1	100	100
Tulare	(Change)	-9.8				(Change)	-4.7			
1 Year Before	24	29.6	81			19	29.7	64		
Year 1 During	16	19.8	81	85.4	100	16	25	64	79.9	87.5
Tuolumne	(Change)	NC				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			5					1		
Year 1 During			5	85	100			1	50	100
Ventura	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before	69	7.8	880					110		
Year 1 During	41	4.7	880	90.9	68.8			110	60.7	60
Yolo	(Change)	15.4				(Change)	0			
1 Year Before	0	0	13			2	6.7	30		
Year 1 During	2	15.4	13	86.5	100	2	6.7	30	93.3	86.7

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-21: Mental Health or Substance Abuse Emergencies for Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY (excludes counties not meeting data quality threshold) for 10.1 & 10.2

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Partners with Mental Health or Substance Abuse Emergencies		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality		Partners with Mental Health or Substance Abuse Emergencies		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality	
	n	%		% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET	n	%		% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET
Statewide										
Totals										
1 Year Before	2226	34.8	6394			2091	38.1	5487		
Year 1 During	631	9.9	6394	83.6	89.6	446	8.1	5487	83.1	86.5
PAF Age										
1. Child										
1 Year Before	241	16.0	1508			283	19.2	1471		
Year 1 During	60	4.0	1508	78.6	84.2	61	4.1	1471	82.0	87.2
2. TAY										
1 Year Before	536	41.9	1279			509	45.0	1132		
Year 1 During	130	10.2	1279	78.7	85.7	125	11.0	1132	81.7	84.4
3. Adult										
1 Year Before	1309	40.9	3199			1123	46.8	2402		
Year 1 During	399	12.5	3199	88.1	93.2	230	9.6	2402	86.3	86.8
4. Older Adult										
1 Year Before	140	34.3	408			176	36.5	482		
Year 1 During	42	10.3	408	83.0	92.9	30	6.2	482	73.5	87.6
Program										
Bay Area										
1 Year Before	233	42.8	545			286	45.0	636		
Year 1 During	60	11.0	545	86.9	97.1	76	11.9	636	89.5	92.6
Central										
1 Year Before	702	37.4	1877			555	45.8	1212		
Year 1 During	233	12.4	1877	90.0	95.4	118	9.7	1212	90.1	88.9
Los Angeles										
1 Year Before	622	28.8	2159			625	31.6	1975		
Year 1 During	98	4.5	2159	73.3	76.1	92	4.7	1975	77.6	74.9
Southern										
1 Year Before	588	36.3	1620			555	37.1	1494		
Year 1 During	212	13.1	1620	88.0	97.8	132	8.8	1494	81.5	96.9
Superior										
1 Year Before	81	42.0	193			70	41.2	170		
Year 1 During	28	14.5	193	91.8	93.8	28	16.5	170	86.5	88.8

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-22: Mental Health or Substance Abuse Emergencies for Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY by County for 10.3 & 10.4

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Partners with Mental Health or Substance Abuse Emergencies		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality		Partners with Mental Health or Substance Abuse Emergencies		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality	
	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET
Amador	Change	LQ				Change	LQ			
1 Year Before			28					15		
Year 1 During			28	6.2	89.3			15	0	100
Berkeley City	Change	NC				Change	-30.4			
1 Year Before			2			13	56.5	23		
Year 1 During			2	100	100	6	26.1	23	94.6	87
Butte	Change	LQ				Change	LQ			
1 Year Before			114					122		
Year 1 During			114	23	90.4			122	60.2	100
Calaveras	Change	NC				Change	DC			
1 Year Before			5					9		
Year 1 During			5	100	100			9	100	100
Colusa	Change	LQ				Change	LQ			
1 Year Before			5					5		
Year 1 During			5	25	40			5	0	0
Contra Costa	Change	-24.4				Change	-27.7			
1 Year Before	29	32.2	90			28	43.1	65		
Year 1 During	7	7.8	90	88.1	100	10	15.4	65	99.6	98.5
Del Norte	Change	DC				Change	LQ			
1 Year Before			5					3		
Year 1 During			5	95	80			3	33.3	33.3
El Dorado	Change	-31.3				Change	-34.6			
1 Year Before	6	37.5	16			11	42.3	26		
Year 1 During	1	6.2	16	93.8	100	2	7.7	26	95.2	96.2
Fresno	Change	-39.8				Change	-67			
1 Year Before	100	49.8	201			139	71.6	194		
Year 1 During	20	10	201	72.8	83.1	9	4.6	194	86.5	89.2
Glenn	Change	-16.7				Change	-52.2			
1 Year Before	8	26.7	30			15	65.2	23		
Year 1 During	3	10	30	93.3	96.7	3	13	23	95.7	87
Humboldt	Change	LQ				Change	-38.1			
1 Year Before			34			11	52.4	21		
Year 1 During			34	66.2	97.1	3	14.3	21	84.5	81
Imperial	Change	-11.6				Change	-10			
1 Year Before	26	15.9	164			11	10	110		
Year 1 During	7	4.3	164	91	97	0	0	110	88.4	97.3
Inyo	Change	-30				Change	LQ			
1 Year Before	4	40	10					5		
Year 1 During	1	10	10	97.5	80			5	95	60
Kern	Change	-47.9				Change	-50			
1 Year Before	83	58.5	142			88	64.7	136		
Year 1 During	15	10.6	142	74.6	100	20	14.7	136	80.1	98.5
Kings	Change	LQ				Change	LQ			
1 Year Before			10					11		
Year 1 During			10	12.5	100			11	43.2	100
Lake	Change	-29.4				Change	-15			
1 Year Before	17	50	34			11	55	20		
Year 1 During	7	20.6	34	98.5	100	8	40	20	97.5	100
Lassen	Change	DC				Change	IC			
1 Year Before			4					6		
Year 1 During			4	100	100			6	100	100
Los Angeles	Change	-24.3				Change	-26.9			
1 Year Before	622	28.8	2159			625	31.6	1975		
Year 1 During	98	4.5	2159	73.3	76.1	92	4.7	1975	77.6	74.9
Madera	Change	-27.3				Change	-36.6			
1 Year Before	19	43.2	44			20	48.8	41		
Year 1 During	7	15.9	44	83	88.6	5	12.2	41	95.7	90.2

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-22 (cont.): Mental Health or Substance Abuse Emergencies for Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY by County for 10.3 & 10.4

	FY-2010/2011				FY-2011/2012			
	Partners with Mental Health or Substance Abuse Emergencies		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality	Partners with Mental Health or Substance Abuse Emergencies		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality
	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1 % with a KET	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1 % with a KET
Mariposa	Change	DC			Change	LQ		
1 Year Before			4				12	
Year 1 During			4	81.2 100			12	60.4 91.7
Merced	Change	-19.2			Change	-10.6		
1 Year Before	11	42.3	26		9	47.4	19	
Year 1 During	6	23.1	26	71.2 100	7	36.8	19	86.8 94.7
Modoc	Change	DC			Change	LQ		
1 Year Before			6				25	
Year 1 During			6	79.2 100			25	69 92
Mono	Change	LQ			Change	LQ		
1 Year Before			1				1	
Year 1 During			1	50 0			1	50 100
Napa	Change	-29.7			Change	-29.5		
1 Year Before	14	51.9	27		8	47.1	17	
Year 1 During	6	22.2	27	79.6 100	3	17.6	17	88.2 100
Nevada	Change	-24			Change	-22.6		
1 Year Before	16	32	50		20	32.3	62	
Year 1 During	4	8	50	90 88	6	9.7	62	78.6 82.3
Orange	Change	-23.5			Change	-23.1		
1 Year Before	107	33.6	318		123	32.7	376	
Year 1 During	32	10.1	318	86.6 98.1	36	9.6	376	90.6 96.8
Placer	Change	LQ			Change	LQ		
1 Year Before			38				32	
Year 1 During			38	55.9 86.8			32	33.6 71.9
Plumas	Change	ALL			Change	LQ		
1 Year Before	5	29.4	17				8	
Year 1 During	0	0	17	73.5 76.5			8	46.9 75
Sacramento	Change	-16.3			Change	-23.1		
1 Year Before	226	31.4	720		117	43	272	
Year 1 During	109	15.1	720	89.6 97.9	54	19.9	272	83 94.9
San Benito	Change	11.8			Change	NC		
1 Year Before	9	52.9	17				5	
Year 1 During	11	64.7	17	100 100			5	80 100
San Bernardino	Change	LQ			Change	LQ		
1 Year Before			552				404	
Year 1 During			552	31.3 67.6			404	52.7 56.9
San Diego	Change	-21.7			Change	-29.6		
1 Year Before	353	38.1	927		321	38.6	831	
Year 1 During	152	16.4	927	89.9 97.3	75	9	831	76.4 96.5
San Francisco	Change	-35.5			Change	-27		
1 Year Before	66	46.8	141		98	36.7	267	
Year 1 During	16	11.3	141	90.2 97.9	26	9.7	267	92 93.3
San Joaquin	Change	-27.5			Change	-32		
1 Year Before	213	34.6	616		159	36.1	440	
Year 1 During	44	7.1	616	96.7 95.1	18	4.1	440	94.9 83
San Luis Obispo	Change	-18.8			Change	-26.9		
1 Year Before	19	27.5	69		12	29.3	41	
Year 1 During	6	8.7	69	90.6 100	1	2.4	41	89 100
San Mateo	Change	-30.3			Change	-21.8		
1 Year Before	12	36.4	33		13	40.6	32	
Year 1 During	2	6.1	33	92.4 90.9	6	18.8	32	98.4 90.6

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-22 (cont.): Mental Health or Substance Abuse Emergencies for Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY by County for 10.3 & 10.4

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Partners with Mental Health or Substance Abuse Emergencies		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality		Partners with Mental Health or Substance Abuse Emergencies		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality	
	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET
Santa Clara	<i>Change</i>	-34.1				<i>Change</i>	-37			
1 Year Before	72	43.1	167			75	45.5	165		
Year 1 During	15	9	167	77.8	95.8	14	8.5	165	82.3	91.5
Santa Cruz	<i>Change</i>	NS				<i>Change</i>	-72.7			
1 Year Before						39	88.6	44		
Year 1 During						7	15.9	44	83.5	86.4
Shasta	<i>Change</i>	-30.3				<i>Change</i>	-25			
1 Year Before	21	63.6	33			10	62.5	16		
Year 1 During	11	33.3	33	97	100	6	37.5	16	98.4	100
Sierra	<i>Change</i>	LQ				<i>Change</i>	NS			
1 Year Before			4					2		
Year 1 During			4	56.2	100			2	100	100
Siskiyou	<i>Change</i>	ALL				<i>Change</i>	ALL			
1 Year Before	4	28.6	14			2	10.5	19		
Year 1 During	0	0	14	91.1	100	0	0	19	75	94.7
Solano	<i>Change</i>	-41.2				<i>Change</i>	ALL			
1 Year Before			68			8	44.4	18		
Year 1 During			68	97.1	95.6	0	0	18	76.4	88.9
Sonoma	<i>Change</i>	LQ				<i>Change</i>	LQ			
1 Year Before			135					71		
Year 1 During			135	68.5	55.6			71	39.4	57.7
Stanislaus	<i>Change</i>	-31				<i>Change</i>	-30.3			
1 Year Before	44	52.4	84			36	47.4	76		
Year 1 During	18	21.4	84	93.2	100	13	17.1	76	92.8	93.4
Sutter/Yuba	<i>Change</i>	-29.6				<i>Change</i>	-41.4			
1 Year Before	22	40.7	54			21	45.7	46		
Year 1 During	6	11.1	54	97.2	98.1	2	4.3	46	94.6	95.7
Tehama	<i>Change</i>	LQ				<i>Change</i>	LQ			
1 Year Before			13					3		
Year 1 During			13	53.8	53.8			3	41.7	33.3
Tri-City	<i>Change</i>	LQ				<i>Change</i>	LQ			
1 Year Before			9					113		
Year 1 During			9	55.6	77.8			113	71.9	62.8
Trinity	<i>Change</i>	LQ								
1 Year Before			6					1		
Year 1 During			6	100	33.3			1	100	100
Tulare	<i>Change</i>	-35				<i>Change</i>	-17.8			
1 Year Before	39	50.6	77			13	23.2	56		
Year 1 During	12	15.6	77	86	100	3	5.4	56	82.6	87.5
Tuolumne	<i>Change</i>	NC				<i>Change</i>	LQ			
1 Year Before			7					2		
Year 1 During			7	78.6	100			2	62.5	100
Ventura	<i>Change</i>	LQ				<i>Change</i>	LQ			
1 Year Before			874					111		
Year 1 During			874	90.8	68.5			111	65.1	63.1
Yolo	<i>Change</i>	-53.8				<i>Change</i>	-51.5			
1 Year Before	9	69.2	13			21	63.6	33		
Year 1 During	2	15.4	13	86.5	100	4	12.1	33	93.9	87.9

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-23: Psychiatric Hospitalizations (Nursing Psychiatric or Psychiatric Hospital) for Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY (excludes counties not meeting data quality threshold) for 11.1 & 11.2

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Partners with Psychiatric Hospitalizations		Total Partners with Data n	Data Quality		Partners with Psychiatric Hospitalizations		Total Partners with Data n	Data Quality	
	n	%		% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET	n	%		% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET
Statewide										
All										
1 Year Before	1345	22.3	6025			1367	26.3	5200		
Year 1 During	905	15.0	6025	83.5	89.0	804	15.5	5200	83.1	86.0
PAF Age										
1. Child										
1 Year Before	134	8.9	1500			180	12.5	1438		
Year 1 During	91	6.1	1500	78.4	84.2	108	7.5	1438	82.0	86.9
2. TAY										
1 Year Before	293	24.3	1205			300	28.1	1069		
Year 1 During	170	14.1	1205	78.5	85.0	178	16.7	1069	81.4	83.6
3. Adult										
1 Year Before	810	27.6	2934			758	34.0	2229		
Year 1 During	572	19.5	2934	88.2	92.6	453	20.3	2229	86.5	86.2
4. Older Adult										
1 Year Before	108	28.0	386			129	27.8	464		
Year 1 During	72	18.7	386	83.2	92.5	65	14.0	464	73.5	87.5
Region										
Bay Area										
1 Year Before	109	21.5	506			154	25.7	599		
Year 1 During	67	13.2	506	87.1	96.6	109	18.2	599	90.2	92.7
Central										
1 Year Before	405	23.1	1752			344	29.5	1166		
Year 1 During	249	14.2	1752	89.8	95.0	185	15.9	1166	90.1	88.3
Los Angeles										
1 Year Before	418	20.0	2087			473	25.0	1890		
Year 1 During	281	13.5	2087	73.4	75.5	278	14.7	1890	77.9	74.4
Southern										
1 Year Before	368	24.7	1491			356	25.8	1378		
Year 1 During	277	18.6	1491	88.0	97.6	201	14.6	1378	80.9	96.9
Superior										
1 Year Before	45	23.8	189			40	24.0	167		
Year 1 During	31	16.4	189	91.4	93.7	31	18.6	167	85.2	88.0

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-24: Psychiatric Hospitalizations (Nursing Psychiatric or Psychiatric Hospital) for Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY by County for 11.3 & 11.4

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Partners with Psychiatric Hospitalizations		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality		Partners with Psychiatric Hospitalizations		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality	
	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET	n	%	n	% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET
Amador	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			28					15		
Year 1 During			28	6.2	89.3			15	0.0	100.0
Berkeley City	(Change)	IC				(Change)	-4.4			
1 Year Before			2			12	52.2	23		
Year 1 During			2	100.0	100.0	11	47.8	23	94.6	87.0
Butte	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			113					122		
Year 1 During			113	23.2	90.3			122	60.2	100.0
Calaveras	(Change)	NC				(Change)	DC			
1 Year Before			5					9		
Year 1 During			5	100.0	100.0			9	100.0	100.0
Colusa	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			5					5		
Year 1 During			5	25.0	20.0			5	0.0	0.0
Contra Costa	(Change)	-13.8				(Change)	-6.2			
1 Year Before	14	16.1	87			12	18.5	65		
Year 1 During	2	2.3	87	87.6	100.0	8	12.3	65	99.6	98.5
Del Norte	(Change)	NS				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			4					3		
Year 1 During			4	100.0	75.0			3	33.3	33.3
El Dorado	(Change)	12.6				(Change)	-11.6			
1 Year Before	5	31.2	16			8	30.8	26		
Year 1 During	7	43.8	16	93.8	100.0	5	19.2	26	95.2	96.2
Fresno	(Change)	-11.5				(Change)	-13.7			
1 Year Before	61	30.5	200			94	49.5	190		
Year 1 During	38	19.0	200	71.1	82.5	68	35.8	190	85.9	87.4
Glenn	(Change)	-3.4				(Change)	-30.5			
1 Year Before	5	16.7	30			10	43.5	23		
Year 1 During	4	13.3	30	93.3	96.7	3	13.0	23	95.7	87.0
Humboldt	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	0.0			
1 Year Before			33			10	43.5	23		
Year 1 During			33	65.2	97.0	10	43.5	23	77.2	78.3
Imperial	(Change)	3.1				(Change)	1.9			
1 Year Before	4	2.5	160			1	0.9	109		
Year 1 During	9	5.6	160	91.2	96.9	3	2.8	109	88.3	97.2
Inyo	(Change)	10.0				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before	1	10.0	10					5		
Year 1 During	2	20.0	10	97.5	80.0			5	95.0	60.0
Kern	(Change)	-25.4				(Change)	-27.1			
1 Year Before	51	37.0	138			52	40.3	129		
Year 1 During	16	11.6	138	74.1	100.0	17	13.2	129	79.7	98.4
Kings	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			11					11		
Year 1 During			11	11.4	100.0			11	43.2	100.0
Lake	(Change)	-14.7				(Change)	0.0			
1 Year Before	14	41.2	34			8	40.0	20		
Year 1 During	9	26.5	34	98.5	100.0	8	40.0	20	97.5	100.0
Lassen	(Change)	IC				(Change)	NS			
1 Year Before			4					6		
Year 1 During			4	100.0	100.0			6	100.0	100.0
Los Angeles	(Change)	-6.5				(Change)	-10.3			
1 Year Before	418	20.0	2087			473	25.0	1890		
Year 1 During	281	13.5	2087	73.4	75.5	278	14.7	1890	77.9	74.4
Madera	(Change)	-7.0				(Change)	-23.6			
1 Year Before	11	25.6	43			14	36.8	38		
Year 1 During	8	18.6	43	84.9	90.7	5	13.2	38	96.1	89.5

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-24 (cont.): Psychiatric Hospitalizations (Nursing Psychiatric or Psychiatric Hospital) for Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY by County for 11.3 & 11.4

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Partners with Psychiatric Hospitalizations		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality		Partners with Psychiatric Hospitalizations		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality	
	n	%		% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET	n	%		% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET
Mariposa	(Change)	NS				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before	SN	SN	4					12		
Year 1 During	SN	SN	4	81.2	100.0			12	60.4	91.7
Merced	(Change)	-3.9				(Change)	-6.2			
1 Year Before	6	23.1	26			5	31.2	16		
Year 1 During	5	19.2	26	71.2	100.0	4	25.0	16	89.1	93.8
Modoc	(Change)	DC				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			6					26		
Year 1 During			6	79.2	100.0			26	66.3	92.3
Mono	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			1					1		
Year 1 During			1	50.0	0.0			1	50.0	100.0
Napa	(Change)	-3.7				(Change)	0.0			
1 Year Before	5	18.5	27			3	17.6	17		
Year 1 During	4	14.8	27	79.6	100.0	3	17.6	17	88.2	100.0
Nevada	(Change)	-8.2				(Change)	-1.7			
1 Year Before	10	20.4	49			7	11.9	59		
Year 1 During	6	12.2	49	88.3	87.8	6	10.2	59	78.0	81.4
Orange	(Change)	-9.4				(Change)	-10.5			
1 Year Before	48	18.7	257			64	21.1	303		
Year 1 During	24	9.3	257	86.9	97.7	32	10.6	303	91.3	96.0
Placer	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			34			12	41.4	29		
Year 1 During			34	55.1	85.3	8	27.6	29	31.0	69.0
Plumas	(Change)	ALL				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before	4	23.5	17					8		
Year 1 During	0	0.0	17	73.5	76.5			8	46.9	75.0
Sacramento	(Change)	-8.2				(Change)	-16.8			
1 Year Before	155	24.3	638			93	37.2	250		
Year 1 During	103	16.1	638	90.0	97.6	51	20.4	250	82.5	94.4
San Benito	(Change)	0.0				(Change)	DC			
1 Year Before	4	23.5	17					5		
Year 1 During	4	23.5	17	100.0	100.0			5	80.0	100.0
San Bernardino	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			502					368		
Year 1 During			502	31.6	65.9			368	52.0	56.0
San Diego	(Change)	-4.0				(Change)	-11.1			
1 Year Before	251	29.0	867			232	29.1	796		
Year 1 During	217	25.0	867	89.7	97.1	143	18.0	796	75.7	96.7
San Francisco	(Change)	-16.7				(Change)	-2.0			
1 Year Before	35	26.5	132			42	16.9	248		
Year 1 During	13	9.8	132	90.3	97.7	37	14.9	248	92.2	92.7
San Joaquin	(Change)	-8.8				(Change)	-9.9			
1 Year Before	105	17.8	589			67	15.4	434		
Year 1 During	53	9.0	589	96.5	94.9	24	5.5	434	95.0	82.7
San Luis Obispo	(Change)	-4.4				(Change)	-2.5			
1 Year Before	14	20.3	69			7	17.1	41		
Year 1 During	11	15.9	69	90.6	100.0	6	14.6	41	89.0	100.0
San Mateo	(Change)	-7.4				(Change)	-6.9			
1 Year Before	5	18.5	27			9	31.0	29		
Year 1 During	3	11.1	27	90.7	88.9	7	24.1	29	98.3	93.1

Appendix: Supporting Data Tables

Table A-24 (cont.): Psychiatric Hospitalizations (Nursing Psychiatric or Psychiatric Hospital) for Partners Reaching 1 Year of Service in FY by County for 11.3 & 11.4

	FY-2010/2011					FY-2011/2012				
	Partners with Psychiatric Hospitalizations		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality		Partners with Psychiatric Hospitalizations		Total Partners with Data	Data Quality	
	n	%		% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET	n	%		% 3Ms in Year 1	% with a KET
Santa Clara	(Change)	2.0				(Change)	-7.9			
1 Year Before	34	23.3	146			42	27.6	152		
Year 1 During	37	25.3	146	78.3	94.5	30	19.7	152	84.5	92.1
Santa Cruz	(Change)	NS				(Change)	-45.5			
1 Year Before			0			30	68.2	44		
Year 1 During			0			10	22.7	44	83.5	86.4
Shasta	(Change)	0.0				(Change)	-7.1			
1 Year Before	10	32.3	31			5	35.7	14		
Year 1 During	10	32.3	31	96.8	100.0	4	28.6	14	98.2	100.0
Sierra	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	NS			
1 Year Before			4					2		
Year 1 During			4	56.2	100.0			2	100.0	100.0
Siskiyou	(Change)	NS				(Change)	NS			
1 Year Before	0	0.0	14			0	0.0	19		
Year 1 During	0	0.0	14	91.1	100.0	0	0.0	19	75.0	94.7
Solano	(Change)	-13.3				(Change)	6.3			
1 Year Before	11	16.2	68			1	6.2	16		
Year 1 During	2	2.9	68	97.1	95.6	2	12.5	16	75.0	87.5
Sonoma	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			128					53		
Year 1 During			128	68.4	53.1			53	35.8	56.6
Stanislaus	(Change)	-13.4				(Change)	-16.9			
1 Year Before	23	30.7	75			26	36.6	71		
Year 1 During	13	17.3	75	93.0	100.0	14	19.7	71	92.3	93.0
Sutter/Yuba	(Change)	-7.7				(Change)	-13.3			
1 Year Before	11	21.2	52			13	28.9	45		
Year 1 During	7	13.5	52	97.1	98.1	7	15.6	45	94.4	95.6
Tehama	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before	LQ	LQ	13					3		
Year 1 During	LQ	LQ	13	53.8	53.8			3	41.7	33.3
Tri-City	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before	SN	SN	9					114		
Year 1 During	SN	SN	9	55.6	77.8			114	71.7	62.3
Trinity	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	NS			
1 Year Before	SN	SN	6					1		
Year 1 During	SN	SN	6	100.0	33.3			1	100.0	100.0
Tulare	(Change)	-12.1				(Change)	-9.2			
1 Year Before	18	24.3	74			8	14.8	54		
Year 1 During	9	12.2	74	85.8	100.0	3	5.6	54	84.3	87.0
Tuolumne	(Change)	IC				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			7					2		
Year 1 During			7	78.6	100.0			2	62.5	100.0
Ventura	(Change)	LQ				(Change)	LQ			
1 Year Before			856					105		
Year 1 During			856	90.7	67.9			105	61.2	59.0
Yolo	(Change)	-46.1				(Change)	-24.3			
1 Year Before	7	53.8	13			12	36.4	33		
Year 1 During	1	7.7	13	86.5	100.0	4	12.1	33	93.9	87.9