



Implementation and Outcomes of Concurrent Planning: Quantitative Findings

2 of 5

This series of publications, *Implementation Outcomes of Concurrent Planning*, details the findings from a quantitative assessment of the practice and outcomes of concurrent planning in six California counties: Contra Costa, Mendocino, Placer, San Bernardino, San Diego, and Yolo. Cases of two cohorts of children entering care (1155 children total) were reviewed. The first cohort entered care in 1993 and 1994; the second cohort entered care between 1998 and 2000. Details on case and family characteristics, concurrent planning practices, and case outcomes over 1 to 3 years were gathered from case files. (For these analyses, the sample was restricted to cases continuing past the jurisdictional hearing and receiving reunification services, as these are the cases for which concurrent planning would be relevant; n=885.)

Finding #2: *There was considerable variation in how the six study counties implemented concurrent planning practice components.*

Concurrent planning practice consists of a number of casework elements, detailed in Finding #1. AB 1544 requires that case plans include a description of the services necessary for the child to attain a permanent home should reunification fail, and note whether a discussion occurred with the parent regarding the option of voluntary relinquishment. It also clarifies that placement in a concurrent planning home, or efforts toward another permanent home that occur concurrently with reunification, do not in and of themselves threaten reasonable efforts to reunify.

As the table on the next page indicates, there is significant variation in how counties have implemented concurrent planning. Some counties have implemented a minimal concurrent planning program; for example, few cases in County B received concurrent planning elements. Other counties have implemented a fuller model, in which most cases receive some concurrent planning practice elements, as for example in County D. Other counties seem to emphasize certain elements over others: in County B, while overall few concurrent planning elements are employed, the option of voluntary relinquishment is discussed with many parents; County F, on the other hand, seems to focus efforts on fully disclosing information to birth parents, and making reunification prognoses.

The limited nature of the legal requirements allow counties maximum flexibility to tailor their concurrent planning programs to fit their needs and resources. Counties have taken advantage of this flexibility to implement concurrent planning programs that differ in intensity and emphasis.

COUNTY CONCURRENT PLANNING PRACTICE ELEMENT USAGE

	County A N=102		County B N=32		County C N=64		County D N=120		County E N=130		County F N=52	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Reunification prognosis	12	12.0	3	9.4	19	30.2	72	61.5	13	10.0	27	52.9
Concurrent plan	32	31.7	2	6.5	27	42.9	91	77.8	51	39.2	15	29.4
SW explored other perm option	27	26.5	3	9.4	9	14.1	72	60.0	31	23.9	16	30.8
SW explored perm with cur fp	30	29.4	5	15.6	9	14.1	50	41.7	32	24.6	17	32.7
Two social workers on case	13	12.8	1	3.1	3	4.7	36	30.0	21	16.2	12	23.1
Full disclosure	43	43.9	6	20.7	37	60.7	91	78.5	52	40.0	40	81.6
Voluntary re-linquinsh. disc.	8	8.1	18	58.1	2	3.3	47	40.5	36	27.7	3	6.1
Fost-Adopt prior to TPR	7	6.9	1	3.1	6	9.4	0	0.0	9	6.9	8	15.4