

NEW YORK STATE
OFFICE OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES
SUPERVISION AND TREATMENT SERVICES FOR JUVENILE PROGRAM (STSJP)
SFY 2014-2015 ANNUAL PLAN

STSJP Plans are due to the Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS) by 7/11/2014

Plans should be submitted to: ocfs.sm.stsjp@ocfs.ny.gov

Please ensure that the title “**Supervision and Treatment Services for Juveniles Plan**” and your county name in the subject field to facilitate the timely review of your STSJP Plan.

Please direct any STSJP Plan questions to either;

Johne.Johnson@OCFS.ny.gov PH. 518-486-4665

Cara.Korn@OCFS.ny.gov PH. 518-408-3999

COUNTY INFORMATION

NAME OF APPLICANT COUNTY, COUNTIES OR JURISDICTION:

Cortland County

LEAD AGENCY FOR STSJP SUBMISSION:

Cortland County Department of Social Services

NAME OF CONTACT PERSON:

Kristen Monroe

CONTACT PERSON'S PHONE NUMBER:

607-753-5305

CONTACT PERSON'S E-MAIL ADDRESS:

Kristen.Monroe@dfa.state.ny.us

STSJP SFY 2014 - 2015

SFY 2014-2015 Starting County Detention Allocation amount	\$ 226,960
SFY 2014-2015 County STSJP Allocation amount	\$ 40,000
SFY 2014 -2015 County Detention Allocation being shifted	\$ 0
Total SFY 2014-2015 STSJP Reimbursement Allocation amount	\$ 40,000
Maximum STSJP Reimbursement amount for a 2014-2015 Plan	\$ 64,800 (57,000, plan amt.)
SFY 2014-2015 STSJP State Share amount	\$ 35,340
SFY 2014-2015 STSJP County Share amount	\$ 21,660
SFY 2014-2015 Revised County Detention Allocation amount	\$ 226,960
TOTAL COUNTY OBLIGATION:	\$ 21,660

SECTION ONE – Analysis of Communities

Provide an analysis that identifies the neighborhoods or communities from which the greatest number of juvenile delinquents and persons in need of supervision (PINS) are remanded to detention or residentially placed. Note any communities or neighborhoods that are different than in last year's plan. Please ensure that your identification of target areas or populations is clearly highlighted in your plan.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Cortland County has a population of around 49,000 people with the largest number of people residing in Cortland City. From April 1, 2013 to March 31, 2014 Cortland County placed 7 youths in non-secure detention facilities and 5 youths in residential treatment centers. Naturally, as a result of the city being the most densely populated, the largest majority of these youths, 5 detention placements and 2 residential placements, were placements from which the youths were located in the Cortland City School District at the time of placement. The remaining youths were located in surrounding school districts within the county at the time of placement. Sufficient resources are available for the CCSI program to work with youth within Cortland City School District and county wide.

SECTION TWO – Description of Services and Programs to be Funded

List the **name of each service and program** who you expect will received STSJP funds, along with the **projected amount of STSJP funds** to be used for each: As a Guide to providing the information needed to properly review your plan, please provide programmatic information in the format listed below;

- Provide the Name of the Provider of the Service/Program.
- The Amount of any Juvenile Detention Services funds projected to be spent for STSJP Services.
- The communities and types of youth targeted.
- The projected number of youth that will be served.

- Answer a series of Demographic questions
- “Please enter each program individually, and if you have more programs than the form accounts for, please use the addendum supplied with this document.”**

OCFS-2121 (6/2014)

STSJP Program One	Coordinated Children's Services Initiative	Type of Program (ATD/ATP)	ATD & ATP
The amount of STSJP funds that your jurisdiction will devote to the services from this program?			\$ 57,000
1. What geographic areas has your analysis suggested you target? Each parent partner position provides us with the means to work with Cortland City Youths and any Cortland County youths and families with a youth that is at risk; alleged or adjudicated juvenile delinquents (JDs); youth alleged or adjudicated to be persons in need of supervision (PINS); and youth alleged to be or convicted as juvenile offenders (JOs), in order to divert these youth from detention, residential care, or placement of any nature outside of their homes.			
2. What is your Jurisdiction's Projected Number of Youth that will be served by this STSJ Program? 22			
Did the program listed above receive STSJP funds for 2013-2014? If so, provide answer the questions below. If not, please proceed to section “STSJP Program Two”.			
1. When did the program start using 2013-2014 STSJP funds? April 1, 2013			
2. How many slots were created in the program with STSJP funds? 10			
3. What was the average length of stay for youth in the program or service? 8-10 months			
4. How many youth received services in the program during 2013-2014? 18			
For programs intended as alternatives to detention, how many youth in the program experienced each of these outcomes:			
1. Successfully completed the program (not re-arrested and appeared in court as directed) 12 youth successfully completed the program. 4 Youth remain open and 2 youth did not successfully complete the program. One was placed in detention and then transitioned from detention to rehab. The second was placed at an Residential Treatment Center.			
2. Did not appear in court when directed to do so All youth appeared in court as directed.			
3. Were re-arrested before appearing in court This data has not been tracked.			
4. Moved to detention because of non-compliance with the program or any reason (other than re-arrest or failure to show at court) Zero youth were moved to detention for non-compliance or any other reason.			
5. What amount of last SFY allocation for this STSJP Service Program was left unspent: \$15,558			

STSJP Program Two		Type of Program (ATD/ATP)	
The amount of STSJP funds that your jurisdiction will devote to the services from this program?			\$
1. What geographic areas has your analysis suggested you target?			
2. What is your Jurisdiction's Projected Number of Youth that will be served by this STSJ Program?			
Did the program listed above receive STSJP funds for 2013-2014? If so, provide answer the questions below. If not, please proceed to section “STSJP Program Three”.			
1. When did the program start using 2013-2014 STSJP funds?			
2. How many slots were created in the program with STSJP funds?			
3. What was the average length of stay for youth in the program or service?			
4. How many youth received services in the program during 2013-2014?			
For programs intended as alternatives to detention, how many youth in the program experienced each of these outcomes:			

1. Successfully completed the program (not re-arrested and appeared in court as directed)
2. Did not appear in court when directed to do so
3. Were re-arrested before appearing in court
4. Moved to detention because of non-compliance with the program or any reason (other than re-arrest or failure to show at court)
5. What amount of last SFY allocation for this STSJP Service Program was left unspent:

STSJP Program Three	Type of Program (ATD/ATP)
The amount of STSJP funds that your jurisdiction will devote to the services from this program?	\$
1. What geographic areas has your analysis suggested you target?	
2. What is your Jurisdiction's Projected Number of Youth that will be served by this STSJ Program?	
Did the program listed above receive STSJP funds for 2013-2014? If so, provide answer the questions below. If not, please proceed to section "STSJP Program Four".	
1. When did the program start using 2013-2014 STSJP funds?	
2. How many slots were created in the program with STSJP funds?	
3. What was the average length of stay for youth in the program or service?	
4. How many youth received services in the program during 2013-2014?	
For programs intended as alternatives to detention, how many youth in the program experienced each of these outcomes:	
1. Successfully completed the program (not re-arrested and appeared in court as directed)	
2. Did not appear in court when directed to do so	
3. Were re-arrested before appearing in court	
4. Moved to detention because of non-compliance with the program or any reason (other than re-arrest or failure to show at court)	
5. What amount of last SFY allocation for this STSJP Service Program was left unspent:	

STSJP Program Four	Type of Program (ATD/ATP)
The amount of STSJP funds that your jurisdiction will devote to the services from this program?	\$
1. What geographic areas has your analysis suggested you target?	
2. What is your Jurisdiction's Projected Number of Youth that will be served by this STSJ Program?	
Did the program listed above receive STSJP funds for 2013-2014? If so, provide answer the questions below. If not, please proceed to section "STSJP Program Five".	
1. When did the program start using 2013-2014 STSJP funds?	
2. How many slots were created in the program with STSJP funds?	
3. What was the average length of stay for youth in the program or service?	
4. How many youth received services in the program during 2013-2014?	
For programs intended as alternatives to detention, how many youth in the program experienced each of these outcomes:	
1. Successfully completed the program (not re-arrested and appeared in court as directed)	
2. Did not appear in court when directed to do so	
3. Were re-arrested before appearing in court	
4. Moved to detention because of non-compliance with the program or any reason (other than re-arrest or failure to show at court)	
5. What amount of last SFY allocation for this STSJP Service Program was left unspent:	

STSJP Program Five	Type of Program (ATD/ATP)
The amount of STSJP funds that your jurisdiction will devote to the services from this program?	\$
1. What geographic areas has your analysis suggested you target?	
2. What is your Jurisdiction's Projected Number of Youth that will be served by this STSJ Program?	
Did the program listed above receive STSJP funds for 2013-2014? If so, provide answer the questions below. If not, please proceed to section "STSJP Program Six".	
1. When did the program start using 2013-2014 STSJP funds?	
2. How many slots were created in the program with STSJP funds?	
3. What was the average length of stay for youth in the program or service?	
4. How many youth received services in the program during 2013-2014?	
For programs intended as alternatives to detention, how many youth in the program experienced each of these outcomes:	
1. Successfully completed the program (not re-arrested and appeared in court as directed)	
2. Did not appear in court when directed to do so	
3. Were re-arrested before appearing in court	
4. Moved to detention because of non-compliance with the program or any reason (other than re-arrest or failure to show at court)	
5. What amount of last SFY allocation for this STSJP Service Program was left unspent:	

STSJP Program Six	Type of Program (ATD/ATP)
The amount of STSJP funds that your jurisdiction will devote to the services from this program?	\$
1. What geographic areas has your analysis suggested you target?	
2. What is your Jurisdiction's Projected Number of Youth that will be served by this STSJ Program?	
Did the program listed above receive STSJP funds for 2013-2014? If so, provide answer the questions below. If not, please proceed to Section Three.	
1. When did the program start using 2013-2014 STSJP funds?	
2. How many slots were created in the program with STSJP funds?	
3. What was the average length of stay for youth in the program or service?	
4. How many youth received services in the program during 2013-2014?	
For programs intended as alternatives to detention, how many youth in the program experienced each of these outcomes:	
1. Successfully completed the program (not re-arrested and appeared in court as directed)	
2. Did not appear in court when directed to do so	
3. Were re-arrested before appearing in court	
4. Moved to detention because of non-compliance with the program or any reason (other than re-arrest or failure to show at court)	
5. What amount of last SFY allocation for this STSJP Service Program was left unspent:	

SECTION THREE – Disproportionality

Provide available information (use objective data or, if none exists, you may provide anecdotal or other information) indicating whether the use of detention or residential placement in your service area shows a significant racial or ethnic disproportionality. What, if any, differences are there from what was noted in last year's plan? Additionally if NO data exists, what measures will your jurisdiction implement to monitor disproportionality? There are currently no identified or significant race or ethnic disproportionalities with our residential or detention placement populations. According to the Cortland County Detention Report and the Cortland County Placement Log, 7 youth were placed in detention between April 1st 2013 and March 31st 2014. 5 youth were placed in residential treatment centers between April 1st 2013 and March 31st 2014. All 12 of these 12 youth placed were Caucasian. According to the U.S. Census Bureau's demographic statistics for Cortland County in 2010, the county is comprised of 95.1% white persons. 100% of our youth placed were white. This proportionality is consistent with data reported two years ago and after monitoring our slight disparity reported from last year (80% Caucasian) we found that these numbers have returned to be fairly consistent with the demographic information reported for Cortland County.

- If such disproportionality exists, describe how the service/programs proposed for funding will address the disproportionality: N/A

SECTION FOUR – Efficacy of the Programs and Services

Provide a description of the proposed services and programs that explain the four listed elements

Please answer the questions below for each of the programs highlighted in Section Two

How they will reduce the number of youth who are detained or residentially placed: Children referred to CCSI are at risk of placement in, or have already cycled through out-of-home placements. The target population for this program will include children and youth who are at risk; alleged or adjudicated juvenile delinquents (JDs); youth alleged or adjudicated to be persons in need of supervision (PINS); and youth alleged to be or convicted as juvenile offenders (JOs), in order to divert these youth from detention or residential care. These youth are often identified as some of the most challenging to serve and who are often passed from one agency to another agency. Frequently, they receive services from two or more systems and there is a need for coordination amongst service providers. CCSI uses a family focused and strength-based approach to working with families across systems. The CCSI program is designed to bring community services providers together at one table in order to develop a service unified, family specific set of goals that will allow the family to be successful within our community.

~ CCSI incorporates a three-tiered approach:

- Family-based Tier I teams are interagency teams assembled to work with a child and family to develop an individualized, strength-based family support plan and to coordinate interagency services. Team composition varies according to the needs of each child and family, but usually includes the child and family, a family support representative, and (as needed) representatives from mental hygiene, education, juvenile justice, probation, health, and other county child and family services systems.
- Community-based Tier II includes county government service agency leaders, school officials, and parents. Tier II serves as the local oversight body for all CCSI activities and works toward implementation of goals and principles, facilitates linkages between service systems, addresses barriers to service delivery and assures continuation of funding locally.
- The Commissioners Committee on Cross Systems Services is a statewide board made up of family representatives and officials from eight state agencies. Commissioners Committee on Cross Systems Services meets regularly to review and implement systems change at the State level.

The Coordinated Children's Services Initiative is intended to be an eight to ten month process of assessment, wraparound meetings, and evaluation. A parent partner is assigned and available to a family 24/7 to help them address immediate needs, offer support, provide a family voice, identify family strengths, concerns, and to help them navigate the various services available to them. Wraparound meetings are arranged for each family to include all service providers and natural family supports. The participants of the wraparound meeting review needs and strengths of the family, a services plan is devised based upon those findings and

projected roles and responsibilities are outlined in this service plan. It is expected that the roles and responsibilities outlined in this service plan will be addressed within the eight to ten month time frame. To assure that this happens, follow up wraparound meetings are scheduled as needed throughout this eight to ten month time frame and the parent partner continues to work with the family, provide updates to the family team, and monitor progress of the plan developed at the wraparound meeting.

CCSI helps reduce the number of youths who are detained or residentially placed through the following manners:

- Improved coordination amongst service providers.
- Improved communication amongst families and service providers.
- Improved treatment acceptability and youth/ family engagement.
- Improved emphasis on teamwork and problem solving.
- Improved identification of family and service goals.
- Improved accountability for families and service providers.
- Improved self-efficacy, feeling of empowerment, and self-esteem.
- Improved social supports and community integration.
- Improved functioning and attendance in school, vocation, and community programs.
- Increases family resources and capacity for coping, planning, and problem solving.
- Provides high risk families with more immediate resources and support.

1. How they are family –focused: CCSI uses a family focused and strength-based approach to working with families across systems. Families are treated as the most important member of the team and their participation is required in order to hold a wraparound meeting. Plans are developed at wraparound meetings with the families input being considered first. This format lends itself to adding supports and creating interventions that are individually tailored to the presenting strengths, needs, and concerns that each family may present with. These plans are monitored and adapted based upon input from the family and their team in order to ensure these plans remain relevant and provide ongoing support to the changing needs of families and their youth.
2. Whether the services/programs are capable of being replicated across multiple sites: CCSI is a statewide initiative that targets children that have complex emotional and behavioral service needs. A 2007 survey shows that 91% of U.S. states have some type of wraparound initiative, with 62% implementing some type of statewide initiative. Over 100,000 youth nationally are estimated to be engaged in a well-defined wraparound process (Bruns, Sather, & Stambaugh, 2008). The CCSI model has been replicated and is being utilized by multiple counties across the state. A strong support network amongst individuals employed in various CCSI programs along with excellent coordination and training resources made available through OCFS allows for a smooth replication process.
3. If the same plan was used last SFY, were the performance outcomes met and describe the outcomes. Please see attachment one for specific details regarding 2013-2014 performance outcomes. We were able to help decrease our number of care days for detention by a little over 45% when compared to the year before. We were able to help decrease the average number of youth placed in residential care by 24% and the average number of youth placed in foster care fell by about 14%. The CCSI program was able to serve 18 families during the last grant cycle which was 2 families short of the goal of 20 that was set for the year. The program held 36 wraparound meetings which was 14 wraparound meetings short of the goal of 50 that was set for the year.
4. What were the barriers if not met? As a result of hiring a replacement parent partner due to staff turnover combined with the time it took to train this new staff person we found that the number of families served by the program and number of wraparounds held for families participating in the program fell a little short of the projected goals for the year. However, we anticipate meeting or exceeding these goals in the upcoming year.

The purpose of STSJP funds is to establish supports and services for youth who, absent these services, are likely to be detained or placed. Funds should therefore be clearly targeted to meet the needs of the types of youth who in the past have been admitted to detention or residentially placed. With this specific purpose in mind, describe the demonstrated effectiveness of the proposed services and programs, or provide (in the form) other justification of why you are proposing these services/programs for funding. Please answer the questions below for each of the programs highlighted in Section Two. According to the Summary of the Wraparound Evidence Base: April 2010 Update, by Eric Bruns, Co-director, National Wraparound Initiative, and Jesse Suter, Research Assistant Professor University of Vermont, as of 2008 seven wraparound research controlled studies had been completed that used random assignment or some type of comparison group design. In 2009, Bruns and Suter published a meta-analytic review of these seven studies (Suter & Bruns, 2009). "This analysis found that, on average across these studies, significant effects of wraparound were found for all four outcome domains that were examined, including living situation, youth behavior, youth functioning, and youth community adjustment. Mean effect sizes across these domains (calculated as the difference between wraparound and control group means at posttest divided by the pooled standard deviation, or Cohen's d) ranged from .25 to .59, with the largest effects found for living situation outcomes (e.g., youth residing in less restrictive, community placements and/or greater stability of placement). The mean effect size across all outcomes was .33-.40, depending on whether studies for which effect sizes were imputed were included (d=.33) or excluded (d=.40). These effect sizes are quite similar to effects found for established EBPs implemented under "real world" conditions and compared to some type of alternative treatment condition" (Suter & Bruns, 2009; Weisz, Jensen-Doss, & Hawley, 2006). Furthermore and more specifically, these controlled studies showed improvements in all of the following behavioral outcome areas:

- Less assaultive
- Ran away less
- Suspended from school less
- Missed less school
- Less likely to be picked up by police
- Less likely to be suspended from school
- Less likely to spend more time incarcerated
- Fewer days on runaway
- Residing in more permanency-type settings
- Less likely to experience a high number of placement changes
- Reside in less restrictive placements
- Reduced recidivism for any offense
- Reduced recidivism for felony
- Fewer days served in detention
- Fewer episodes in detention
- Less likely to serve in detention

The Coordinated Children's Services Initiatives (CCSI) is an established program within

Cortland County that has existing community buy-in, community leadership, and is a program that has already shown successful outcomes. The Cortland County Coordinated Children's Services Initiative (CCSI) was fully functional and began accepting applications for families in November 2010. From November 2010 until December 31, 2012, the program served 88 youths and families with children who are at risk of placement outside of their home or who have a complex set of service needs and that are working with three or more service providers. Of these 88 youths, 55 were identified as being at risk of out of home placement as a result of DSS, PINS, Probation or CSE involvement. Of the 88 families that the program has worked with, only six youth have been placed outside of their home. Approximately 93% of the families that have worked with CCSI have been successfully diverted from placement; saving an estimated \$900,000 if each of these children had been placed in foster care (This is calculated using the lowest estimates of placing a child in foster care, which is approx. \$30/day times the average length a child is spending in foster care. If these children had been placed in detention or a higher level of care the costs could be up to \$350/day and show a much high cost savings. CCSI has played an integral role in helping the County develop and continue a downward trend over the past three years in detention days and placements. In addition, the CCSI program has been utilized to assist 9 youths with being reunited with their families. In these instances the CCSI program opened during a detention placement or as part of a discharge plan.

The STSJP grant has allowed our program to expand from one parent partner to two full time parent partners and 1 part time parent partner. Our full time parent partners hold a caseload of approximately 10-12 youths. The addition of a full time parent partner and part time parent partner has enabled our program to more than double the population that we are able to serve and it has enabled us to cut down on lengthy waiting lists that we had started facing before the addition of these positions. Smaller waitlists have enabled us to reach families sooner to begin addressing their needs in a timelier manner. The addition of these parent partner positions has enabled our program to serve a larger number of at risk youth and families; reducing numbers of detention and residential placements and the time spent in these facilities.

SECTION SIX – Performance Outcomes

For 2014-2015, provide the projected performance outcomes for your proposed services and programs, being sure to include:

- An estimate of the anticipated reductions in detention utilization and residential placements: (1). Our goal is to reduce the total number of care days of detention by 5% through March 31, 2015. (2). Decrease the number of youth placed in residential and foster care placements by 5% by March 31, 2015. (3). Improve coordination and communication amongst service providers and families through the use of family wraparound meetings. Our goal is to hold approximately 50 wraparound meetings for these families and youth through March 31, 2015.
- Other projected positive outcomes for youth who participate in the services and programs: N/A

SECTION SEVEN – Assessment of Success Achieving Previous Performance Outcomes

Although performance outcome data for 2013-2014 may be incomplete because many jurisdictions were unable to implement programs until late in the year and data-producing structures are not yet in place, we are asking you to provide available data on your STSJP programs for each of the following parameters for 2013-2014 year. The inclusion of that information will help establish local and state baseline information on SSJP programs and may be useful in informing discussions about potential improvements to be made in your STSJP Plan.

- What were your projected performance outcomes in your 2012-2013 STSJP Plan for your proposed services and programs: (1). Our goal is to reduce the total number of care days of detention and residential placements by 5% through March 31, 2014. (2). Reduce foster care placement rates within the county by 5% through March 31, 2014. (3). Improved coordination and communication amongst service providers and families through the use of family wraparound meetings. Our goal is to hold approximately 50 wraparound meetings for these families and youth through March 31, 2014.
- Were there other positive outcomes for youth participating in STSJP services and programs? N/A

Please provide the following information for your county or the jurisdiction served by your STSJP programs for 2013-2014, indicating if the geographic area is anything other than countywide: Countywide

TTL number of youth under 16 arrested: 52

TTL number of youth admitted to detention programs: 7

	Secure detention:	0
	Non-Secure detention	7
TTL Number of youth placed out of their home as part of a disposition in a JD and/or PINs case:		
	Number of JDs placed with OCFS or LDSS:	OCFS-0, LDSS-2
	Number of PINs placed:	1
TTL Number of youth who received service and programs as a result of STSJP funding:		18

COMMENTS

Please assess whether the services and programs in your 2013-2014 STSJP Plan achieved the projected reductions in detention utilization and residential placements and other performance outcomes. If they did not, what were the barriers?

Please see attachment one for specific details regarding 2013-2014 performance outcomes. We were able to help decrease our number of care days for detention by a little over 45% when compared to the year before. We were able to help decrease the average number of youth placed in residential care by 24% and the average number of youth placed in foster care fell by about 14%. The CCSI program was able to serve 18 families during the last grant cycle which was 2 families short of the goal for the year. The program also held 36 wraparound meetings which was 14 wraparound meetings short of the goal for the year.

As a result of hiring a replacement parent partner due to staff turnover combined with the time it took to train this new staff person we found that the number of families served by the program and number of wraparounds held for families participating in the program fell a little short of the projected goals for the year. However, we anticipate meeting or exceeding these goals in the upcoming year.

Are there any changes in allocations or practices planned for 2014-2015 based on experiences in 2013-2014? Please list those changes.

After reviewing the amount of our STSJP allocation and what was being spent we determined that the STSJP money could support an additional part time 15 hour per week parent partner. This additional part time parent partner will be added during the 2014-2015 year and will enable the program to serve a larger number of at risk youth and families. In addition, a coordinated and targeted approach has been developed between the Department of Social Services, The Coordinated Children's Services Initiative, and Probation in order to have additional youth that are alleged juvenile delinquents be referred for CCSI services when the petition is received by the Probation Department.

**SECTION EIGHT – Cooperative Applications Submitted Jointly by Two or More Counties
(Complete this section only if this is a joint application)**

Two or more eligible local jurisdictions (counties) may join together to establish, operate, and maintain supervision and treatment services for juveniles programs and may make and perform agreements in connection therewith . Counties submitting such applications must provide the following information:

- Describe the provisions for the proportionate cost to be borne by each county:

N/A

- Describe the manner of employment of personnel across and between counties in the cooperative:

N/A

- Identify whether a single fiscal officer shall be the custodian of the funds made available for STSJP:

N/A

SECTION NINE– Additional Comments

APPROVAL OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

As Chief Executive Officer of the applicant municipality named on Page 1, I certify that I approve of this Supervision and Treatment Services for Juveniles Program Plan.

Name (Please Print)

Date

X

Signature

INSTRUCTIONS:

Instructions for properly processing an STSJP plan.

- a. Once you have opened a copy of the OCFS-2121 form, please immediately use the "Save As" function in Microsoft Word to save a copy of the document on your computer.
 - b. Please save your STSJP plan using the following format; (Somewhere County 2014-2015 STSJP Plan)
 - c. Work from the "saved" county plan document using it to record all of your county's information.
 - d. Once you have satisfactorily completed entering the required data, save the document, print the plan.
 - e. Then have the person named in the plan as the CEO sign the hard copy of the document.
 - f. Upload the signed copy of the plan and send it to OCFS via the STSJP email address at ocfs.sm.stsjp@ocfs.ny.gov
-