



COLORADO
Department of Human Services

The Honorable John W. Hickenlooper
Governor of Colorado
136 State Capitol
Denver, CO 80203

October 1, 2015

Dear Governor Hickenlooper:

This letter is sent as a cover to the Core Services Program Evaluation Report submitted pursuant to C.R.S. 26-5.5-104 (6):

“On or after July 1, 1994, the Executive Director of the State Department shall annually evaluate the statewide Family Preservation Program and shall determine the overall effectiveness and cost-efficiency of the Program. On or before the first day of October of each year, the Executive Director of the State Department shall report such findings and shall make recommended changes, including budgetary changes, to the Program to the General Assembly, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and the Governor. In evaluating the Program, the Executive Director of the State Department shall consider any recommendations made by the interagency Family Preservation Commission in accordance with section 26-5.5-106. To the extent changes to the Program may be made without requiring statutory amendment, the Executive Director may implement such changes, including the changes recommended by the commission acting in accordance with subsection (7) of this section.”

Sincerely,

Reggie Bicha
Executive Director

Enclosures

Cc: Doug Friednash, Chief of Staff





**Core Services Program
Annual Evaluation Report**
January 1, 2014 - December 31, 2014



COLORADO

**Office of Children,
Youth & Families**

Division of Child Welfare

Core Services Program Annual Evaluation Report Calendar Year 2014

Submitted to:

Colorado Department of Human Services
Office of Children, Youth, and Families
Division of Child Welfare

Contact: Robert Werthwein
robert.werthwein@state.co.us
303.866.4544

Submitted by:

Marc Winokur, PhD
Social Work Research Center
School of Social Work
Colorado State University
A107 Behavioral Sciences Building
Fort Collins, CO 80523
970.491.0885

www.ssw.chhs.colostate.edu/research/swrc

Colorado State University

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Executive Summary	ii
1. Background and Introduction.....	1
1.1. Overview of the Core Services Program	1
1.2. Description of the Core Services Program	2
1.3. Goals of the Core Services Program	3
1.4. Context of the Core Services Program	3
1.5. Enhancements to the Core Services Program	4
1.6. Outline of the Current Report.....	5
2. Implementation of the Core Services Program.....	6
2.1. Children, Youth, and Families Served in Calendar Year 2014	6
2.2. Services Provided in Calendar Year 2014.....	8
3. Outcomes of the Core Services Program.....	11
3.1. Service Effectiveness	12
3.2. Service Goal Attainment	15
3.3. Follow-up Outcomes	21
4. Costs of the Core Services Program	28
4.1. Cost per Service Episode.....	28
4.2. Cost per Client	31
4.3. Cost per Child/Youth	33
4.4. Cost Efficiency	34
5. Family Preservation Commission Report Findings	36
5.1. Service Availability, Capacity, and Accessibility	36
5.2. Service Delivery	37
5.3. Service Collaboration.....	39
5.4. Service Funding	39
6. Conclusions and Implications	40
6.1. Conclusions	40
6.2. Limitations	41
6.3. Implications.....	42
Appendix A - Core Services Program Evaluation Methods	43
Appendix B - Core Services County Designed Programs by County	48

Acknowledgements

The Social Work Research Center at Colorado State University, the independent evaluator for the Core Services Program, worked closely with the Division of Child Welfare within the Office of Children, Youth, and Families at the Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) to prepare this report. We would like to acknowledge the following Core Services Coordinators, CDHS staff, and county personnel for their contributions.

Renee Beck
Joni Bedell
Sharon Blum
Perry Boydstun
Sara Boylan
Claudia Budd
Tonia Burnett
Matthew Dodson
Betty Donovan
Kim DuBois
Susan Eilertsen
Linda Elliott
Josiah Forkner
Carolyn Fox
Carol Friedrich
Dee Green
Jennifer Gribble
Judy Griego
Matt Harris
Tim Hart
Hollie Hillman
Irene Holguin-Sanchez
Sheila Hudson-Macchietto
Martha Johnson
Kelly Keith
Jody Kern
Karen Kinblade
Connie Linn
Sharon Longhurst-Pritt
Mary Longmire

Arlene Lopez
Lori Lundgren
Philip Maes
Tressesa Martinez
Janeen McGee
Pamela McKay
Lanie Meyers Mireles
Janell Miller
Kindra Mulch
Jennifer O'Hearon-Cole
Dennis Pearson
Patricia Phillips
Kristin Pulatie
Laura Rascon
Kathy Reano
Erin Rinaldo
Donna Rohde
Catherine Salazar
Kendra Schleff
Taunia Shipman
Michael Sidinger
Jerri Spear
Jamie VieghausZak
Tommy Vigil
Ruth Wallace Porter
Susan Walton
Linda Warsch
Catherine Weaver
Barb Weinstein

Special Thanks

Graig Crawford
**Jefferson County Department of
Human Services**

Melinda Cox
Katie Facchinello
Alexandra Stuart
Jon Sushinsky
**Colorado Department of
Human Services**

Core Services Program Annual Evaluation Report Calendar Year 2014

Executive Summary

Background and Introduction

The Core Services Program was established within the Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) in 1994 and is statutorily required to provide strength-based resources and support to families when children/youth are at imminent risk of out-of-home placement, in need of services to return home, or to maintain a placement in the least restrictive setting possible. Responding to the complexity and variability in the needs of children, youth, and families across the diverse regions of Colorado, the Core Services Program combines the consistency of centralized state administrative oversight with the flexibility and accountability of a county administered system. This approach allows for individualized services to meet the needs of children, youth, and families across diverse Colorado communities.

The statewide Core Services Program is built to address four clinical emphases:

1. Focus on family strengths by directing intensive services that support and strengthen the family and protect the child/youth;
2. Prevent out-of-home placement;
3. Return the child/youth in placement to their own home, or unite the child/youth with their permanent families;
4. Provide services that protect the child/youth.

Each of the 64 counties and one Colorado Tribe (the Southern Ute Indian Tribe) annually develop plans to address these four goals through locally tailored strategies and services. Each jurisdiction designs a unique mix of required and county designed services, resulting in a multifaceted array of services and opportunities along with accompanying implementation challenges.

The Core Services Program is based on a foundation of research and practice in family preservation. Family preservation services are generally short-term, family-based services designed to support families in crisis by improving parenting and family functioning while keeping children/youth safe. These services were developed, in part, as a response to a federal requirement to demonstrate reasonable efforts to prevent removal of children from their homes. Family preservation services grew out of the recognition that children/youth need a safe and stable family and that separating children/youth from their families and communities removes them from natural supports and often causes trauma, leaving lasting negative effects.

The goals of the Core Services Program are to safely maintain children/youth in the home, return children/youth home, promote the least restrictive setting for children/youth, and/or provide services for families at-risk of further involvement in the child welfare system. These goals are achieved in two ways. The first is the provision of services directly to the child/youth. These services promote well-being and may work to address mental or physical health issues that act as family stressors. The second is the provision of services directly to adult caregivers on behalf of the child/youth.

In most cases, the primary goal is for children/youth to remain in the home. In cases where safety concerns prompt a need to remove a child/youth from the home, services work to return that child/youth home in a safe and timely manner. In cases where safety requires the child/youth to be permanently placed out of the home, services focus on stabilizing and maintaining the least restrictive out-of-home placements (including adoptive and

foster homes). These priorities are reflected in the service goals created for each child/youth, which must be entered each time a new Core Service is authorized.

During the 2011 Legislative Session, House Bill 11-1196, Flexible Funding for Families, was passed into law. The language allowed counties to provide prevention and intervention services with existing funding sources, such as the State Child Welfare Block, Core Services Program allocation, and the IV-E Waiver funding. This is referenced as Program Area Three (PA3), which is a mechanism to: (1) provide services for children and families who do not have an open child welfare case, but who are at risk of involvement with child welfare; (2) close cases with no safety concerns and continue providing services with a support plan; and (3) help children and youth in out-of-home (OOH) care to step-down to the least restrictive placement setting. Colorado county departments of human/social services are able to use state and federal funds to provide, and account for, prevention services to children, youth, and families prior to a referral to child welfare, or to screened out referrals. If county departments choose to provide preventative services to children, youth, and families, they are able to directly provide services through qualified staff, or contract with available service providers in their community. PA3 is optional, based on county by county available funding and ability to provide preventative services. Prevention services are offered as 100% voluntary to a family.

In 2012, Governor Hickenlooper announced a new child welfare plan, “Keeping Kids Safe and Families Healthy 2.0”. The Master Plan detailed a common practice approach for Colorado’s 64 counties and two Tribes designed to strengthen the state’s child welfare system. Keeping Kids Safe and Families Healthy 2.0 identified five core strategies: (1) common practice approach, (2) performance management, (3) workforce development, (4) funding alignment, and (5) transparency and public engagement. In 2013, the second phase of the plan built upon the five core strategies by revamping the front end of Colorado’s child protection system through enhanced screening of calls reporting possible child abuse or neglect; new prevention strategies to assist families before they become part of the system; and training for mandatory reporters so at-risk children come to the attention of the child protection system sooner.

The Core Services Program Evaluation Calendar Year (CY) 2014 report, produced by the Social Work Research Center in the School of Social Work at Colorado State University, is designed to describe the outcomes and costs of the Core Services Program across Colorado to provide meaningful data to support decisions made by the Office of Children, Youth, and Families, Division of Child Welfare, and county Core Services Programs. Significant progress has been made in consistently documenting services in Colorado Trails (Trails), which is the Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS), and the County Financial Management System (CFMS), which allows for more accurate tracking of service provision, service outcomes, payment, and costs.

Implementation of the Core Services Program

The Core Services Program is structured as a state-supervised, county-administered system with the Colorado Department of Human Services overseeing funding allocations and working with county staff to set policies and procedures. The legislative authorization requires access to specific services statewide, while maintaining flexibility at the local level as each county operates the Core Services Program to meet the unique needs of families and communities.

Children and Families Served during CY 2014. In CY 2014, 25,747 distinct clients (unduplicated individuals) were served by the Core Services Program. This represents a decrease of 3.6% in distinct clients served from CY 2013. Overall, 54% of the distinct clients were children/youth directly receiving services and 46% were adults receiving services on behalf of a child/youth. Services provided primarily to adults include mental health services and substance abuse treatment. While these services are delivered to adults, they benefit children/youth by allowing them to remain in or return to their homes. Overall, 15,482 distinct children/youth received or benefitted (services provided on behalf of a child/youth) from Core Services. This represents a 3.3% decrease in distinct children/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services from CY 2013.

Services Provided in CY 2014. There were 29,595 service episodes (merged service authorizations within the same case for the same provider, service type, and clients) open at any time in CY 2014. This represents a 0.8% decrease in service episodes from CY 2013. County designed services represent the most common type of service provided, with 30% of all episodes statewide. This is unsurprising given that this general category encompasses an array of specific services that are identified by each individual county as necessary to meet unique needs in the community. County designed services encompass components of the menu of Core Services, yet are structured in their delivery and tracked uniquely to gain detailed data on evidenced-based programs, as well as programs that are providing positive outcomes in communities around the state.

Outcomes of the Core Services Program

The primary mission of the Core Services Program is to protect the safety and well-being of Colorado's children/youth by supporting stable families, preventing out-of-home placement, promoting the least restrictive setting for children/youth, and/or providing services for families at-risk of further involvement in the child welfare system. The evaluation report presents short-term service effectiveness outcome measures being tracked by caseworkers in Trails, service goal attainment outcomes, and follow-up child welfare involvement outcomes for children with a closed case in CY 2013. In addition, sub-analyses are reported for service goal (remain home, return home, or least restrictive setting), program area, provider type (purchased or county provided), service type, and county.

Service Effectiveness. Approximately 80% of service episodes for CY 2014 were closed with a “successful” (61%) or “partially successful” (19%) service effectiveness outcome. This represents a 3% increase in service episodes closed with a successful or partially successful outcome from CY 2013. Service episodes for children/youth with a remain home service goal, a child protection or Program Area Five (PA5) designation, as well as county provided services, were significantly more likely than service episodes with a return home service goal, a youth in conflict or Program Area Four (PA4) designation, or purchased services to have a successful or partially successful service effectiveness outcome.

Service Goal Attainment. The service goal was attained in 80% of all service episodes from CY 2014. This represents a 1% increase in service goal attainment from CY 2013. The service goal attainment rate was 89% for remain home, 82% for least restrictive setting, and 70% for return home. Consistent with previous years' findings, the remain home service goal attainment rate was 94% based on whether a child/youth had an open removal on the day the service ended.

Follow-up Outcomes. Based on a distinct count of 5,678 children/youth with closed cases in CY 2013, 45% had a subsequent referral, 31% had a subsequent assessment, 6% had a subsequent founded assessment, 12% had a subsequent case, 5% had a subsequent placement, 10% had a subsequent DYC placement (detention or commitment), and 2% had a subsequent DYC commitment. The DYC outcomes were only measured for children/youth ages 10 and older at time of case closure. These outcomes are very similar to the follow-up outcomes from CY 2013.

Costs of the Core Services Program

The evaluation report presents average cost per service episode, average cost per client, and average cost per child/youth receiving or benefitting from services. In addition, a cost efficiency measure estimates the additional out-of-home placement costs that would be incurred by counties in lieu of providing Core Services to children/youth in the home or in out-of-home care.

Cost per Service Episode. The cost per service episode measure is intended to provide an overall average cost for each paid service intervention. This analysis only includes the costs for paid services (costs for no-pay services cannot be calculated from Trails) and does not include the cost of county-provided services. Per-episode costs for county provided services cannot be accurately obtained from Trails data because there is no designation in the

available data systems for how each county designates its Core Services allocations into specific types of services. The average cost per service episode for all therapeutic Core Service episodes closed in CY 2014 was \$2,294 with an average service duration of 129 days. This represents an increase of 5.2% or \$114 in average cost per service episode from CY 2013. For therapeutic assessments/evaluations, the average cost per service episode was \$607 with an average service duration of 35 days. For therapeutic interventions, the average cost per service episode was \$2,560 with an average service duration of 144 days.

Cost per Client and Cost per Child/Youth. The average cost per client statewide for CY 2014 was \$1,761 based on total expenditures of \$45,533,247 and 25,856 clients served. This represents an increase of 6.9% or \$113 in average cost per client from CY 2013. The average cost per child/youth statewide for CY 2014 was \$2,926 based on total expenditures of \$45,533,247 and 15,563 children/youth receiving or benefitting (services provided on behalf of the children/youth) from Core Services. This represents an increase of 6.8% or \$186 in average cost per child/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services from CY 2013.

Cost Efficiency. Overall cost efficiency was calculated using a methodology that assumes that all children/youth would have been placed in out-of-home care in the absence of Core Services. Based on actual Core Service and out-of-home placement expenditures of \$109,742,027 and an estimated cost of \$161,257,088, an additional **\$51,515,061** would have been spent by county agencies statewide in CY 2014 if OOH placements had been provided exclusively instead of a combination of Core Services and OOH placements. This equates to an additional \$15 per child/youth per involved day that would have been spent statewide in CY 2014.

Over the past two calendar years, an additional \$120 million would have been spent by county agencies statewide if out-of-home placements had been provided exclusively instead of a combination of Core Services and out-of-home placements.

Conclusions

The following conclusions illustrate the high level of overall program success in regard to service effectiveness, service goal attainment, subsequent child welfare involvement, and cost efficiency for children, youth, and families in Colorado.

The findings from this report support the Core Services Program as an effective approach to strengthening Colorado families by keeping or returning children/youth home or in the least restrictive setting while maintaining safety.

The Core Services Program is Working as Designed. The Core Services Program is clearly serving the population targeted by the legislation and is providing the appropriate levels of support, as evidenced by the findings that less than 5% of children/youth had a subsequent placement after receiving or benefitting from Core Services. Furthermore, at involvement closure, 99% of children/youth who received PA3 services remained home.

Core Services are Effective in Achieving Treatment Success. Approximately 80% of all service episodes in CY 2014 were determined to be successful or partially successful with 95% of PA3 service episodes determined to be as such. Sexual abuse treatment had the highest percentage of episodes closed with either a successful or partially successful designation. Furthermore, 80% of counties reported that the availability and capacity of their Core Services program is adequate to address the needs of children, youth, and families.

Core Services Facilitate Service Goal Attainment. The service goal was attained by 80% of children/youth with an involvement closed in CY 2014. Similar to past reports, the remain home service goal was attained in 94% of service episodes when calculated based on if the child/youth had an open removal on the day the service ended. Life skills and county designed services had the highest remain home service goal attainment rates, while special economic assistance and life skills had the highest return home service goal attainment rate. County provided services and service episodes for children/youth with a PA5 designation were significantly more likely to

have service goal attainment for remain and return home service goals than were purchased services and services episodes for children/youth with a PA4 designation. In addition, Core Services coordinators reported that an increase in family meetings, improved communication and service coordination, and the diversity of the service array resulting from collaborative efforts positively impacted service goal attainment outcomes.

Core Services Impacts Subsequent Child Welfare Involvement. For children/youth with a closed case in CY 2013, 45% had a subsequent referral, 31% had a subsequent assessment, 6% had a subsequent founded assessment, 12% had a subsequent case, 5% had a subsequent placement, 10% had a subsequent DYC placement (detention or commitment), and 2% had a subsequent DYC commitment. The two DYC follow-up outcomes were only measured for children/youth ages 10 and older at time of case closure.

Core Services Provide Substantial Cost Efficiency for Colorado. Without the Core Services Program, it is estimated that Colorado counties would have spent an additional \$52 million in CY 2014 on OOH placements for children/youth. This figure is based on children/youth who were able to entirely avoid OOH placements by using Core Services, children/youth who were reunified in a shorter time frame by using Core Services, as well as children/youth who entered the least restrictive setting as a result of Core Services. The cost efficiency measure also takes into account the expenditures for OOH days for children/youth that were not able to remain home. Core Services coordinators also noted that the use of external service providers and the implementation of front-loaded, in-home, and county designed services impacted the decrease in OOH placement rates and OOH lengths of stay.

Implications

Core Services are especially effective for county provided services and for children/youth with a service goal of remain home or a PA5 designation. As a result, increased efforts to improve outcomes for purchased services and for children/youth with a service goal of return home or a PA4 designation are warranted.

The key implication is that the Core Services Program is an essential component of the continuum of care in Colorado.

Although the positive findings for service effectiveness and service goal attainment are preliminary, it appears that current Core Service prevention efforts should be enhanced and offered widely to families at risk for child welfare involvement to maximize the opportunity for lowering case numbers and stepping down children/youth to lower levels of care. The Core Services Program also aligns well with other child welfare prevention efforts recently implemented in the state. As such, future evaluation efforts should look across the prevention/intervention array to identify common metrics of outcome, cost, and process effectiveness to provide the state and counties with a holistic understanding of how prevention programs work together to promote the safety, permanency, and well-being of children, youth, and families in Colorado. This effort commenced with the collection of baseline outcomes for this year's report and will continue in next year's report with the analysis of follow-up outcomes for children/youth who received PA3 services in CY 2014.

Colorado remains a national leader by investing heavily in therapeutic systems and by tracking the associated services, outcomes, and costs in SACWIS so that policy and program decisions can be informed by timely and consistent data. To facilitate the cutting-edge use of administrative data to support practice innovations, continued enhancements to Trails should be considered to more efficiently collect, enter, and access data regarding service delivery, costs, and outcomes. In addition, counties should be engaged through ongoing training and consultation opportunities to make full use of the available data for quality improvement purposes. Finally, counties should be encouraged to consult with one another to identify promising practices, evidence-based services, and areas of collaboration for enhancing their Core Services Programs.

Core Services Program Annual Evaluation Report Calendar Year 2014

1. Background and Introduction

The Core Services Program was established within the Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) in 1994 and is statutorily required to provide strength-based resources and support to families when children/youth are at imminent risk of out-of-home placement, in need of services to return home, or to maintain a placement in the least restrictive setting possible. Responding to the complexity and variability in the needs of children, youth, and families across the diverse regions of Colorado, the Core Services Program combines the consistency of centralized state administrative oversight with the flexibility and accountability of a county administered system. This approach allows for individualized services to meet the needs of children, youth, and families across diverse Colorado communities.

Colorado Revised Statute (C.R.S.) 26-5.5-104(6) authorizing the Core Services Program mandates that the Department annually provide “an evaluation of the overall effectiveness and cost-efficiency of the program and any recommended changes to such program.” This report, produced by the Social Work Research Center in the School of Social Work at Colorado State University, responds to this mandate and is designed to describe the outcomes and costs of the program across the state in order to provide meaningful data to support decisions made by the Office of Children, Youth, and Families, Division of Child Welfare, and county Core Services programs.

1.1. Overview of the Core Services Program

The statewide Core Services Program is built to address four clinical emphases:

1. Focus on family strengths by directing intensive services that support and strengthen the family and protect the child/youth;
2. Prevent out-of-home placement;
3. Return the child/youth in placement to their own home, or unite the child/youth with their permanent families;
4. Provide services that protect the child/youth.

Each of the 64 counties and one Colorado Tribe (the Southern Ute Indian Tribe) annually develop plans to address these four goals through locally tailored strategies and services. Each jurisdiction designs a unique mix of required and county designed services, resulting in a multifaceted array of services and opportunities along with accompanying implementation challenges. In addition, policies guiding documentation and tracking of services and expenditures differ from county to county, adding challenge to the evaluation effort. Each county and tribe share a common mission to support the children/youth and families of their communities, and have the common desire and obligation to deliver services that are meaningful to the families that receive them while remaining accountable to all citizens in the community.

Each county and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe have a Core Services Coordinator that oversees the program locally. However, the range of responsibilities of each coordinator varies considerably. Typically, the Core Services Coordinator role in larger counties is more specialized and specific to the Core Services Program, compared with coordinators in smaller counties, who must fill multiple responsibilities. In the cases of larger counties, the coordinator is likely responsible for a range of duties, including:

- Engaging service providers in the community, including program development (identifying programs that meet the needs of the local community), reviewing invoices, and holding regular meetings with providers;
- Consulting with caseworkers to match families with services;

- Ensuring that data is being entered consistently;
- Monitoring expenditures vs. allocations throughout the year;
- Writing, monitoring, and accurately entering the service contracts;
- Completing the annual Core Plan and Family Preservation Commission Report, and chairing the Family Preservation Commission;
- Periodically reviewing Core Services Program cases (e.g., identifying cases where a service has been open for a long time and identifying strategies to achieve service goals).

In medium-sized counties, other duties may include the supervision of caseworkers and direct involvement with other family service programs in the county (including House Bill 1451 - Collaborative Management Program). In smaller counties, coordinators are often also responsible for direct delivery of providing Core Services. Counties where the Colorado Practice Model and/or Differential Response (DR) are being implemented have direct involvement from either the Core Services Coordinator or other representatives from the program (caseworker, supervisor, etc.).

The Core Services Coordinators meet quarterly with the state's Program Administrator to discuss issues (such as funding, legislation, and Department policies and rules) that affect implementation at the county level. Additionally, a subgroup of Core Services Coordinators serves as an Evaluation Advisory Board to this evaluation. They provide valuable insight and guidance in terms of data interpretation and isolating the key county issues that help to provide context to the quantitative results presented here.

1.2. Description of the Core Services Program

The Core Services Program is based on a foundation of research and practice in family preservation. Family preservation services are generally short-term, family-based services designed to support families in crisis by improving parenting and family functioning while keeping children/youth safe. These services were developed, in part, as a response to a federal requirement to demonstrate reasonable efforts to prevent removal of children from their homes. Family preservation services grew out of the recognition that children/youth need a safe and stable family and that separating children/youth from their families and communities removes them from natural supports and often causes trauma, leaving lasting negative effects.

In Colorado, a subsection of the legislation mandating the Family Preservation Commissions defines "family preservation services" as assistance that focuses on a family's strengths and empowers a family by providing alternative problem-solving techniques and child-rearing practices, as well as promoting effective responses to stressful living situations for the family. This assistance includes resources that are available to supplement existing informal support systems for the family. There are ten designated types of "family preservation services" and this array of services constitutes the Core Services Program. Each of the ten designated Core Service types are listed below with definitions from Child Welfare Services, Staff Manual Volume 7.

Aftercare Services: Any of the Core Services provided to prepare a child for reunification with his/her family or other permanent placement and to prevent future out-of-home placement of the child.

County Designed Services: An optional service tailored by the specific county in meeting the needs of families and children in the community in order to prevent the out-of-home placement of children or facilitate reunification or another form of permanence. County designed services encompass components of the menu of Core Services, yet are structured in their delivery and tracked uniquely to gain detailed data on evidenced-based programs, as well as programs that are providing positive outcomes in communities around the state.

Day Treatment: Comprehensive, highly structured services that provide education to children and therapy to children and their families.

Home-Based Intervention: Services provided primarily in the home of the client and include a variety of services, which can include therapeutic services, concrete services, collateral services, and crisis intervention directed to

meet the needs of the child and family. See Section 7.303.14 for service elements of therapeutic, concrete, collateral, and crisis intervention.

Intensive Family Therapy: Therapeutic intervention typically with all family members to improve family communication, functioning, and relationships.

Life Skills: Services provided primarily in the home that teach household management, effectively accessing community resources, parenting techniques, and family conflict management.

Mental Health Services: Diagnostic and/or therapeutic services to assist in the development of the family services plan and to assess and/or improve family communication, functioning, and relationships.

Sexual Abuse Treatment: Therapeutic intervention designed to address issues and behaviors related to sexual abuse victimization, sexual dysfunction, sexual abuse perpetration, and to prevent further sexual abuse and victimization.

Special Economic Assistance: Emergency financial assistance of not more than \$400 per family per year in the form of cash and/or vendor payment to purchase hard services. See Section 7.303.14 for service elements of hard services.

Substance Abuse Treatment Services: Diagnostic and/or therapeutic services to assist in the development of the family service plan, to assess and/or improve family communication, functioning and relationships, and to prevent further abuse of drugs or alcohol.

1.3. Goals of the Core Services Program

The goals of the Core Services Program are to safely maintain children/youth in the home, return children/youth home, promote the least restrictive setting for children/youth, and/or provide services for families at-risk of further involvement in the child welfare system. These goals are achieved in two ways. The first is the provision of services directly to the child/youth. These services promote well-being and may work to address mental or physical health issues that act as family stressors. The second is the provision of services directly to adult caregivers on behalf of the child/youth.

In most cases, the primary goal is for children/youth to remain in the home. In cases where safety concerns prompt a need to remove a child/youth from the home, services work to return that child/youth home in a safe and timely manner. In cases where safety requires the child/youth to be permanently placed out of the home, services focus on stabilizing and maintaining the least restrictive out-of-home placements (including adoptive and foster homes). These priorities are reflected in the service goals created for each child/youth, which must be entered each time a new Core Service is authorized.

1.4. Context of the Core Services Program

In 2012, Governor Hickenlooper announced a new child welfare plan, “Keeping Kids Safe and Families Healthy 2.0”. The Master Plan detailed a common practice approach for Colorado’s 64 counties and two Tribes designed to strengthen the state’s child welfare system. Keeping Kids Safe and Families Healthy 2.0 identified five core strategies:

- Common practice approach
- Performance management
- Workforce development
- Funding alignment
- Transparency and public engagement

In 2013, the second phase of the plan built upon five core strategies by revamping the front end of Colorado's child protection system through enhanced screening of calls reporting possible child abuse or neglect; new prevention strategies to assist families before they become part of the system; and training for mandatory reporters so at-risk children come to the attention of the child protection system sooner. As defined in the new child welfare plan, the common practice approach includes the following components:

- Ensure that every child in Colorado is safe and healthy, as that is paramount to everything we do every day.
- Implement one practice approach and philosophy for the entire state to ensure the collaboration of best practices in caring for kids.
- Expand the Differential Response model - which allows workers to use more than one method of response to reports of child abuse and neglect, and allows them to better engage family and community members - to additional counties throughout the state.
- Develop new pathways for adolescents with behavioral health needs.
- Create a new statewide hotline providing one number to report child abuse or neglect across Colorado, and a corresponding public awareness and prevention campaign.
- Increase prevention services for referrals that do not meet the criteria to open an investigation, but for which the family is in need of additional supports to ensure they remain stable and do not become part of the child protection system. These prevention programs include:
 - Colorado Community Response offers comprehensive voluntary family-focused services which include family engagement, case management, direct services, resource referral, home visits, collaborative goal-setting, financial decision-making assistance and coaching, and group-based parent education.
 - SafeCare is a nationally recognized, evidence-based, in-home parent education program that provides direct skills training to caregivers in the areas of parenting, home safety, and child health. The parenting model was developed in 1979, and home visitors have been trained in at least 17 states and several countries. In Colorado, SafeCare is being implemented as a voluntary service for families in an effort to prevent entry or re-entry to the child welfare system.
 - Nurse Family Partnership - Augmentation introduces first time parents to maternal and child health to ensure access to assistance programs. The program also promotes awareness of child abuse and neglect by providing targeted training and collaboration between NFP nurses and county child welfare staff.
- Provide additional funding for counties that have previously overspent in their Core Services allocations. The increased funding allows counties to provide more resources to keep kids safely in their own homes. An additional \$6.1 million in funding for Core Services was distributed to 64 counties to provide additional services to keep children safely in their own homes.
- Standardize use of RED (Review, Evaluate, Direct) Teams across the state to ensure consistent screening practice and that each and that each referral is properly assessed and assigned.

1.5. Enhancements to the Core Services Program

During the 2011 Legislative Session, House Bill 11-1196, Flexible Funding for Families, was passed into law. The language allowed counties to provide prevention and intervention services with existing funding sources, such as the State Child Welfare Block, Core Services Program allocation, and the IV-E Waiver funding. This is referenced as Program Area Three (PA3), which is a mechanism to: (1) provide services for children and families who do not have an open child welfare case, but who are at risk of involvement with child welfare; (2) close cases with no safety concerns and continue providing services with a support plan; and (3) help children and youth in out-of-home (OOH) care to step-down to the least restrictive placement setting.

Historically, county departments may have provided prevention services with other funding sources. Through the summer of 2013, rule was crafted by the PA3 Policy Subgroup, which is comprised of county and state child welfare staff. The prevention, intervention, and PA3 rules were presented to the State Board of Human Services for final reading October 4, 2013, and promulgated into Volume 7 Rule, effective January 1, 2014. The impact of the statute and rule is that Colorado county departments of human/social services are able to use state and federal funds to provide and account for prevention services to children, youth, and families prior to a referral to child welfare, or to screened out referrals. If county departments choose to provide preventative services to children, youth, and families, they are able to directly provide services through qualified staff, or contract with available service providers in their community. PA3 is optional, based on county by county available funding and ability to provide preventative services. Prevention services are offered as 100% voluntary to a family.

This enhancement requires documentation of activity in Colorado Trails (Trails), which is the Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS). As such, a PA3 Trails Subgroup was tasked with designing a Trails build to support the PA3 policy, as it was being determined. By reporting and tracking in one automated system, the Division of Child Welfare and county departments are able to collect and analyze outcome data for services delivered, as well as track funding used for prevention and intervention service delivery. These data elements also provide information on those families served who never enter the child welfare system. To maintain the integrity of the 100% voluntary prevention mechanism, only client names and date of birth are required in Trails to provide services for these families. Counties who choose to provide services under PA3 are accountable to report those preventative services in Trails. The Trails build went live on January 12, 2014.

In 2014, 42 counties were approved to use Core Services funding for prevention and/or intervention services. Many counties are determining what their process for offering volunteer services will be, and how they will track this type of service provision, without the mandatory monthly contacts and all other child welfare related requirements. A few counties are exploring and developing prevention/intervention service delivery policies and procedures. Colorado is excited to be able to offer prevention/intervention services with their Child Welfare Block and Core Services Program funding, and know this practice will evolve as counties recognize the possibilities.

1.6. Outline of the Current Report

This Core Services Program Annual Evaluation Report is based on a Calendar Year (CY) rather than a State Fiscal Year (SFY). This will allow for the timely and efficient documentation and collection of Core Services outcome and cost information, so that the data can be more fully analyzed and reported to meet the statutory requirement.

The CY 2014 report features descriptive and comparative analyses of children, youth, and families served, services provided, service effectiveness, service goal attainment, subsequent child welfare involvement, cost per service episode, cost per client, cost per child, and cost efficiency. Initially a quasi-experimental design was proposed with a comparison of children who received Core Services while in OOH care with children who were in placement but never received Core Services. However, there are so few children in OOH placement who do not receive Core Services that such a design was not feasible. To facilitate group comparisons of outcomes and costs, subgroup analyses were employed based on service goal, program area, provider type, service type, and county. In addition, the new outcomes, analyses, and enhanced data used in the CY 2013 report will serve as a baseline year for the tracking of future trends regarding the effectiveness and cost-efficiency of the Core Services Program.

Following this **Background and Introduction** section is a description of the **Implementation of the Core Services Program**. This section describes the numbers and demographics of clients and children/youth served and the numbers and types of services authorized through the Core Services allocation. This section provides a general overview of the types of services offered across the state and at the county level.

The **Outcomes of the Core Services Program** section is presented in the following three ways: (1) short-term service effectiveness outcome measures being tracked by designated county staff in Trails; (2) service goal attainment outcomes based on closed involvements in CY 2014; and (3) longer-term 12-month child welfare involvement outcomes for children with a closed case in CY 2013. In addition, sub-analyses are presented for all outcome measures for service goal, program area, provider type, service type, and county.

The **Costs of the Core Services Program** section is presented in the following four ways: (1) average cost per service episode reported by county, service goal, and program area for purchased services; (2) average costs per client reported overall and by service type, service goal, county, program area, and provider type; (3) average cost per child/youth reported overall and by service type, service goal, county, program area, and provider type, and (4) cost efficiency reported by comparing estimated out-of-home placement costs in lieu of Core Service provision with actual service and out-of-home placement costs for children who received Core Services in CY 2014.

The **Family Preservation Commission Report Findings** section includes a qualitative narrative of successes and challenges facing the Core Services Program from a county and tribe perspective. The findings are derived from the Family Preservation Commission Reports, which were filed electronically for the first time, and spanned 18 months from July 2013 through December 2014 for the CY 2014 report.

The **Conclusions and Implications** section of the report discusses conclusions, limitations, and implications based on the implementation, outcome, and cost analyses presented in this year's report.

The **Core Services Program Evaluation Methods** (see Appendix A) provides the design, methods, data collection procedures, and data analysis techniques used in the outcome and cost evaluations. The **Core Services County Designed Programs by County** (see Appendix B) details the county designed service array for each county.

2. Implementation of the Core Services Program

The Core Services Program is structured as a state-supervised, county-administered system with CDHS overseeing funding allocations and working with county staff to set policies and procedures. The legislative authorization requires access to specific services statewide, while maintaining flexibility at the local level, as each county administers the Core Services Program to meet the unique needs of families and communities. Significant progress has been made in consistently documenting services in Trails and the County Financial Management System (CFMS) databases, which allows for more accurate tracking of service provision, service outcomes, and payment.

As noted in last year's report, with the change from a fiscal year to a calendar year report, it is not appropriate to compare Core Services allocations to expenditures because they cannot be accurately determined. Specifically, allocations are based on a fiscal year time frame, so the only way to estimate a calendar year allocation would be to average the allocations of two consecutive fiscal years. Furthermore, higher expenditures tend to be recorded in Trails or CFMS during the second half of the fiscal year, which results in an underestimation of expenditures for a calendar year period.¹

2.1. Children, Youth, and Families Served in CY 2014

The following definitions guided the analysis of children, youth, and families served during CY 2014.

Clients served - based on clients specified in the Trails service authorization as 'Clients Receiving Services' and includes both adults and children/youth.

Children/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services - based on the following criteria:

- Program Area 3 (prevention) - services provided in these involvements are typically connected to a parent but recorded on behalf of a child/youth in Trails. Because of this, the Trails service authorization may only be recorded for a single child/youth when in fact there may be several children/youth involved in the case. To account for this data entry limitation, all children/youth who are active in the involvement at the time the service is initiated are counted as a child/youth benefitting from the service.

¹ An estimation of the CY 2014 allocation would be \$52,252,785 based on averaging SFY 2014 (\$51,605,245) and SFY 2015 (\$52,900,325) allocations.

- Program Area 4 (youth in conflict) and Program Area 6 (adoption and emancipation) - services provided in these cases only count children/youth for whom the service authorization was entered since these services are directed toward a specific child/youth.
- Program Area 5 (child protection) - services provided in these cases are typically connected to a parent but recorded on behalf of a child/youth in Trails. Because of this, the Trails service authorization may only be recorded for a single child/youth when in fact there may be several children/youth involved in the case. To account for this data entry limitation, all children/youth who are active in the case at the time the service is initiated are counted as a child/youth benefitting from the service.

Although a child/youth could receive one Core Service and benefit from another Core Service, they would only be included once in the distinct count of children/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services.

Service episodes - created by merging individual service authorizations open any time during the calendar year within the same case, for the same provider and service type, and for the same set of clients receiving the service (as long as there was not a gap in service dates of more than 30 consecutive days).

As displayed in Table 1, **25,747 distinct clients (unduplicated individuals)** were served by the Core Services Program in CY 2014. This represents a decrease of 3.6% in distinct clients served from CY 2013. Overall, 54% of the distinct clients were children/youth directly receiving services and 46% were adults receiving services on behalf of the child/youth. Services provided primarily to adults include mental health services and substance abuse treatment. While these services are delivered to adults, they benefit children/youth by allowing them to remain in or return to their homes.

A total of 25,747 unduplicated individuals were served by the Core Services Program in CY 2014.

Table 1: Total Number of Distinct Clients Served by the Core Services Program in CY 2014

Distinct Count	Children/Youth		Adults		Total	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Clients	14,005	54.4	11,742	45.6	25,747	100.0

Table 2 shows that the largest groups served by the Core Services Program were White, non-Hispanic (49%) and Hispanic (30%). The average age of children served by Core Services was 8.5 years, while the average age of adults served by Core Services was 35.5 years.

Table 2: Race/Ethnicity of Distinct Clients Served by Core Services Program in CY 2014

Race/Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent
White, Non-Hispanic	12,622	49.0
Hispanic	7,739	30.1
Black or African American	1,835	7.1
Multiple Races	726	2.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	157	0.6
Asian	125	0.5
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	26	0.1
Did not Indicate	2,517	9.8
Total	25,747	100.0

As defined on page 6, **15,482 distinct children/youth from 8,823 cases/involvements received or benefitted** from Core Services in CY 2014. This represents a 3.3% decrease in distinct children/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services from CY 2013. On the following page, Table 3 shows that 80% of all children/youth receiving or benefitting from services were designated as Program Area Five (PA5), 15% were designated as Program Area Four (PA4), 3% were designated as PA3, and 2% were designated as Program Area Six (PA6). Of the 428 children/youth designated as PA3, 160 had a prior child welfare case (37%) with 43 designated as PA4 and 117 designated as PA5.

This illustrates the use of PA3 as a mechanism to close cases with no safety concerns but continue services, and to step down children/youth into the least restrictive placement setting.

Table 3: Total Number of Children/Youth Receiving or Benefitting from Core Services Program by Program Area in CY 2014

Program Area	Frequency*	Percent
PA3 Services	428	2.7
PA4 Cases	2,330	15.0
PA5 Cases	12,527	80.4
PA6 Cases	294	1.9
Total	15,579	100.0
*The total does not match the overall sample size of distinct children benefitting because children with multiple involvements during the year can have more than one program area designation.		

2.2. Services Provided in CY 2014

As defined above, there were **29,595 service episodes** open at any time in CY 2014. This represents a 0.8% decrease in service episodes from CY 2013. Table 4 shows that 78% of service episodes were associated with children with a PA5 designation while 19% were associated with PA4, and 2% were associated with PA6 and PA3, respectively. As for provider type, 66% of service episodes were purchased from external providers by counties while 34% were internally provided by counties. Almost three-quarters of all service episodes were for new services provided in CY 2014, while 70% of all service episodes closed in CY 2014.

Table 4: Characteristics of Service Episodes in CY 2014 (N = 29,595)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
Program Area		
PA3 Services	448	1.5
PA4 Cases	5,499	18.6
PA5 Cases	23,075	78.0
PA6 Cases	573	1.9
Provider Type		
Purchased	19,634	66.3
County provided	9,961	33.7
Service Status		
New Service in CY 2013	21,968	74.2
Closed Service in CY 2013	20,759	70.1

As displayed in Table 5, the most frequent Core Service type was county designed services at 30%, followed by substance abuse treatment at 14%, and home-based interventions at 13%.

Table 5: Service Episodes in CY 2014 by Service Type (N = 29,595)

Service Type	Frequency	Percent
County Designed Services	8,962	30.0
Substance Abuse Treatment	4,202	14.2
Home-based Interventions	3,965	13.4
Mental Health Services	3,230	10.9
Life Skills	2,994	10.1
Intensive Family Therapy	2,846	9.6
Special Economic Assistance	2,136	7.2
Sexual Abuse Treatment	855*	2.9
Day Treatment	405	1.4
Total	29,595	100.0
*Core Services cannot pay for sexual abuse treatment for court-ordered offender treatment.		

Substance abuse treatment is the most frequent service type other than county designed services. As displayed in Table 6, the most frequent substance types, for the 3,618 closed substance abuse treatment service episodes from CY 2014, were alcohol and methamphetamines at 24% each, followed by marijuana at 21%.

Table 6: *Substance Types for Substance Abuse Treatment Service Episodes in CY 2014 (N = 3,618)*

Substance Type	Frequency	Percent
Alcohol	864	23.9
Methamphetamines	849	23.5
Marijuana	745	20.6
Unknown/Other	467	12.9
Other Opiates	251	6.9
Cocaine/Crack	223	6.2
Heroin	184	5.1
Depressants	25	.7
Stimulants	10	.3
Total	3,618	100.0

The authorizing legislation for the Core Services Program requires that each of these service types be made available in each county and/or region. In addition, counties have the flexibility to create county designed service types to fit the needs of their unique communities. County designed services encompass components of the menu of Core Services, yet are structured in their delivery and tracked uniquely to gain detailed data on evidenced-based programs, as well as programs that are providing positive outcomes in communities around the state.

Table 7 shows the number of service episodes for each of these service types. The most common county designed service type is family meetings which include family group decision making and Community Evaluation Team (CET)/Team Decision Making (TDM). Other popular county designed services are supervised visitation, child mentoring and family support, family empowerment, and structured parenting time. These six service types comprise approximately 62% of all county designed service episodes in CY 2014.

Table 7: *Service Episodes by County Designed Service Type for CY 2014*

Service Type	Frequency	Percent
Family Group Decision Making	1,942	21.7
Supervised Visitation	1,420	15.8
CET/TDM	598	6.7
Child Mentoring and Family Support	587	6.5
Family Empowerment	584	6.5
Structured Parenting Time	465	5.2
Domestic Violence Intervention Services	359	4.0
Multi Systemic Therapy	349	3.9
Mediation	305	3.4
Mentoring	290	3.2
Community Based Family Support Services	227	2.5
Family Outreach	214	2.4
Life Skills Apprenticeship	186	2.1
Child/Family Service Therapist	180	2.0
Day Treatment Alternative	179	2.0
Nurturing Program	148	1.7
Youth Intervention Program	146	1.6
Direct Link	136	1.5
Behavioral Health	113	1.3
Functional Family Therapy	111	1.2
Reconnecting Youth	83	.9
Mobile Intervention Team	72	.8
Parenting Skills	60	.7

Table 7 (continued)

Service Type	Frequency	Percent
Play Therapy	59	.7
Youth Outreach	48	.5
Adolescent Support Group	47	.5
Family Strengths	16	.2
Adoption Counseling	13	.1
Foster Care/Adoption Support	10	.1
Trauma-informed Care Services	8	.1
Discovery Groups	7	.1
Total	8,962	100.0

Table 8 shows the count of clients served, the count of children/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services, and total service episodes for CY 2014 by county.

Table 8: *Count of Clients Served, Children/Youth Receiving or Benefitting from Core Services, and Service Episodes for CY 2014 by County*

County	Clients Served*	Percent of State Total	Children/Youth Receiving/Benefitting*	Percent of State Total	Service Episodes	Percent of State Total
Statewide	25,856	100.0%	15,563	100.0%	29,595	100.0%
Adams	2,413	9.3	1,556	10.0	2,607	8.8
Alamosa	241	.9	175	1.1	253	.9
Arapahoe	2,667	10.3	1,656	10.6	2,507	8.5
Archuleta	97	.4	61	.4	87	.3
Baca	8	.0	6	.0	18	.1
Bent	46	.2	31	.2	41	.1
Boulder	708	2.7	470	3.0	741	2.5
Broomfield	99	.4	88	.6	161	.5
Chaffee	34	.1	33	.2	31	.1
Cheyenne	19	.1	8	.1	8	.0
Clear Creek	47	.2	31	.2	35	.1
Conejos	110	.4	63	.4	106	.4
Costilla	57	.2	52	.3	85	.3
Crowley	10	.0	14	.1	23	.1
Custer	6	.0	4	.0	3	.0
Delta	159	.6	107	.7	147	.5
Denver	2,210	8.5	1,537	9.9	2,283	7.7
Dolores	2	.0	5	.0	12	.0
Douglas	529	2.0	279	1.8	515	1.7
Eagle	173	.7	89	.6	156	.5
El Paso	4,360	16.9	2,156	13.9	5,989	20.2
Elbert	81	.3	58	.4	89	.3
Fremont	582	2.3	399	2.6	785	2.7
Garfield	186	.7	128	.8	183	.6
Gilpin	49	.2	16	.1	28	.1
Grand	87	.3	50	.3	81	.3
Gunnison/ Hinsdale	51	.2	25	.2	44	.1
Huerfano	31	.1	41	.3	43	.1
Jackson	8	.0	10	.1	8	.0
Jefferson	1,679	6.5	1,184	7.6	2,365	8.0
Kiowa	14	.1	9	.1	13	.0
Kit Carson	50	.2	24	.2	42	.1
La Plata/ San Juan	322	1.2	220	1.4	630	2.1

Table 8 (continued)

County	Clients Served*	Percent of State Total	Children/Youth Benefitting*	Percent of State Total	Service Episodes	Percent of State Total
Lake	43	.2	22	.1	72	.2
Larimer	3,041	11.8	1,578	10.1	3,165	10.7
Las Animas	94	.4	65	.4	84	.3
Lincoln	44	.2	28	.2	46	.2
Logan	238	.9	134	.9	212	.7
Mesa	941	3.6	594	3.8	1,410	4.8
Moffat	130	.5	65	.4	160	.5
Montezuma	71	.3	75	.5	139	.5
Montrose	353	1.4	178	1.1	218	.7
Morgan	301	1.2	187	1.2	378	1.3
Otero	120	.5	90	.6	97	.3
Ouray/ San Miguel	41	.2	29	.2	65	.2
Park	53	.2	25	.2	68	.2
Phillips	25	.1	16	.1	13	.0
Pitkin	34	.1	19	.1	37	.1
Prowers	126	.5	75	.5	116	.4
Pueblo	1,309	5.1	780	5.0	1,846	6.2
Rio Blanco	42	.2	17	.1	26	.1
Rio Grande/ Mineral	111	.4	67	.4	85	.3
Routt	53	.2	33	.2	47	.2
Saguache	70	.3	34	.2	41	.1
Sedgwick	5	.0	6	.0	5	.0
Summit	98	.4	44	.3	93	.3
Teller	133	.5	67	.4	120	.4
Washington	52	.2	24	.2	29	.1
Weld	1,041	4.0	626	4.0	786	2.7
Yuma	152	.6	100	.6	118	.4

*The total does not match the overall sample size of distinct clients served or distinct children or youth receiving or benefitting from services because a child/youth could have had multiple involvements during the year with more than one county.

3. Outcomes of the Core Services Program

The Core Services Program provides direct services to children, youth, and families to:

- Safely maintain children/youth at home;
- Support a successful transition back into the home after removal;
- Stabilize and maintain out-of-home placements, including foster and adoptive homes;
- Support transitions to and maintenance of out-of-home placements in the least restrictive setting;
- Prevent children, youth, and families from becoming involved with child welfare (Volume 7.000.1A).

Trails data support the analysis of Core Services Program outcomes in numerous ways. When a service authorization is closed, the designated county staff records the residence of the child/youth, a clinical judgment regarding the degree of treatment completion, and whether specified treatment goals were met. These indicators are not definitive evidence of program success, but are short-term measures of service effectiveness and service goal attainment which also allows for follow-up outcomes to be assessed.

3.1. Service Effectiveness

The service effectiveness outcome indicates how effective each service was at achieving the intended treatment objective(s) and is derived from the 'Outcome Code' selection in Trails that is entered by the designated county staff at the closure of Core Service episodes. The available selections for service outcomes in Trails are:

- **Successful** - the service achieved the Core Service goal and treatment objective
- **Partially Successful** - the client made progress in treatment but Core Service goal was not achieved
- **Not Successful, Did not Engage** - the client did not engage in treatment
- **Not Successful, No Progress** - the client engaged in treatment, but treatment objective and Core Service goal were not met
- **Evaluation/Single-Service only** - evaluation or single-service only, no treatment provided
- **Service Not Completed/Service Completed** - for special economic assistance only

While there is some variation across counties, “successful” generally refers to a case where all (or nearly all) treatment goals are met. “Partially successful” refers to services authorizations closed when the client made some progress in treatment, but not all treatment goals were met. While this outcome is subjective in nature, it does provide a clinical judgment of the success of each specific treatment. This, in turn, allows for a comparison of short-term outcomes across different types of services and different providers.

The “service completed” and “service not completed” outcomes are used exclusively for special economic assistance. Service episodes closed with either of these reasons were not included because they do not provide an indication of the effectiveness of the service. In addition, service episodes closed with the outcome of “evaluation/single-service only” were removed from the service effectiveness analysis because they do not represent an actual service intervention, but rather an evaluation for the need for services (e.g., psychological evaluation) and the outcome code selection does not provide an indication of the actual effectiveness of the service. Outcome code selections also are not recorded in Trails when service episodes are closed due to the following service closure/leave reasons: (1) contract funds expended (when system generated not caseworker selected); (2) moved out of county; (3) case transferred to another county; (4) opened in error; (5) change in funding source; or (6) payee wrong code.

During the 2014 calendar year, 18,727 total service episodes were closed in Trails. However, the final service effectiveness sample size was 13,334 service episodes after service episodes closed with one of the exclusionary outcomes (service completed, service not completed, or evaluation/single-service only) or one of the closure/leave reasons with a missing outcome code were removed.

Table 9 shows the overall service effectiveness outcomes for CY 2014 across all service types, service goals, and program areas. Approximately 80% of service episodes in CY 2014 were closed with a “successful” (61%) or “partially successful” (19%) outcome designation while 11% were closed with a “not successful, did not engage” outcome and 9% were closed with a “not successful, no progress” outcome. This represents a 3% increase in service episodes closed with a successful or partially successful outcome from CY 2013.

Approximately 80% of all service episodes were determined to be successful or partially successful.

Table 9: *Service Effectiveness Outcomes for Closed Service Episodes in CY 2014*

Service Outcome	Frequency	Percent
Successful	8,124	60.9
Partially Successful	2,528	19.0
Not Successful, Did Not Engage	1,438	10.8
Not Successful, No Progress	1,244	9.3
Total	13,334	100.0

To further explore service effectiveness outcomes, sub-analyses were conducted for service goal, provider type, program area, service type, and county. The "successful" and "partially successful" outcomes were combined into a single outcome category in the service effectiveness analysis while the "not successful" outcome category is comprised of service episodes with an outcome of either "not successful, did not engage" or "not successful, no progress". Chi-square tests were used to determine statistical significance for the service goal, provider type, and program area analyses, but not for service type and county.²

As displayed in Table 10, service episodes for children/youth with a remain home service goal (85.5%) or the least restrictive setting service goal (85.1%) at time of service initiation were significantly more likely ($p < .001$) to have a successful or partially successful service outcome than were children/youth with a return home service goal (73.7%).

Table 10: Service Effectiveness Outcomes by Service Goal for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2014

Service Goal	Successful/Partially Successful		Not Successful	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Least Restrictive Setting	200	85.1	35	14.9
Remain Home	5,797	85.5	986	14.5
Return Home	4,655	73.7	1,661	26.3
Total	10,652	79.9	2,682	20.1

Table 11 shows that county provided service episodes (85.1%) were significantly more likely ($p < .001$) to have a successful or partially successful service outcome than were purchased service episodes (77.5%).

Table 11: Service Effectiveness Outcomes by Provider Type for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2014

Provider Type	Successful/Partially Successful		Not Successful	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Purchased	7,109	77.5	2,061	22.5
County Provided	3,543	85.1	621	14.9
Total	10,652	79.9	2,682	20.1

As displayed in Table 12, service episodes for children/youth with a PA5 or PA6 designation were significantly more likely ($p < .05$) to have a successful or partially successful service outcome than were service episodes for children/youth with a PA4 designation. Service episodes for children/youth with a PA3 designation at time of service initiation had a 94.8% success rate. Because prevention services are 100% voluntary, the effectiveness outcome for PA3 service episodes are not directly comparable with the other program areas.

Table 12: Service Effectiveness Outcomes by Program Area for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2014

Program Area	Successful/Partially Successful		Not Successful	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
PA3 Services	147	94.8	8	5.2
PA4 Cases	2,103	77.3	619	22.7
PA5 Cases	8,237	80.3	2,024	19.7
PA6 Cases	165	84.2	31	15.8
Total	10,652	79.9	2,682	20.1

On the following page, Table 13 shows that sexual abuse treatment (88%) and county designed services (84%) had the highest percentage of episodes closed in CY 2014 with either a successful or partially successful designation.

² Significance testing was used to determine whether differences between groups were due to chance (not significant) or related to group membership (statistically significant). For example, a statistically significant difference between provider types would indicate that county provided services are related to better outcomes than are purchased services. A probability (p value) less than .05 indicates that the group difference is not due to chance.

Substance abuse treatment (67%) and day treatment (74%) and had the lowest rates of successful or partially successful outcomes in CY 2014.

Table 13: Service Effectiveness Outcomes by Service Type for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2014

Service Type	Successful/Partially Successful		Not Successful	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Sexual Abuse Treatment	276	88.2	37	11.8
County Designed	3,667	84.2	688	15.8
Home-based	1,642	82.3	352	17.7
Intensive Family Therapy	1,206	81.5	273	18.5
Life Skills	1,277	80.0	320	20.0
Mental Health	1,044	79.6	267	20.4
Day Treatment	182	74.3	63	25.7
Substance Abuse Treatment	1,358	66.6	682	33.4
Total	10,652	79.9	2,682	20.1

Table 14 shows the service effectiveness outcomes for service episodes closed in CY 2014 by county.

Table 14: Service Effectiveness Outcomes by County for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2014

County*	Successful/Partially Successful		Not Successful	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Statewide	10,652	79.9	2,682	20.1
Adams	753	73.9	266	26.1
Alamosa	97	74.0	34	26.0
Arapahoe	1,036	80.2	256	19.8
Archuleta	29	87.9	4	12.1
Bent	12	70.6	5	29.4
Boulder	211	78.7	57	21.3
Broomfield	63	80.8	15	19.2
Chaffee	4	100.0	0	0.0
Cheyenne	2	100.0	0	0.0
Clear Creek	10	71.4	4	28.6
Conejos	58	84.1	11	15.9
Costilla	15	93.8	1	6.3
Crowley	6	85.7	1	14.3
Delta	48	76.2	15	23.8
Denver	678	71.8	266	28.2
Douglas	194	82.2	42	17.8
Eagle	61	73.5	22	26.5
El Paso	1,960	83.4	390	16.6
Elbert	25	83.3	5	16.7
Fremont	407	90.0	45	10.0
Garfield	34	72.3	13	27.7
Gilpin	12	92.3	1	7.7
Grand	23	74.2	8	25.8
Gunnison/Hinsdale	17	94.4	1	5.6
Huerfano	10	71.4	4	28.6
Jefferson	819	70.0	351	30.0
Kiowa	5	55.6	4	44.4
Kit Carson	5	55.6	4	44.4
La Plata/San Juan	264	86.3	42	13.7
Lake	21	84.0	4	16.0
Larimer	1,821	88.5	237	11.5
Las Animas	14	46.7	16	53.3
Lincoln	9	100.0	0	0.0
Logan	79	96.3	3	3.7
Mesa	371	80.7	89	19.3

Table 14 (continued)

County*	Successful/Partially Successful		Not Successful	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Moffat	52	74.3	18	25.7
Montezuma	36	92.3	3	7.7
Montrose	64	78.0	18	22.0
Morgan	163	83.6	32	16.4
Otero	24	58.5	17	41.5
Ouray/San Miguel	18	100.0	0	0.0
Park	23	88.5	3	11.5
Phillips	2	40.0	3	60.0
Pitkin	13	86.7	2	13.3
Prowers	31	72.1	12	27.9
Pueblo	540	70.9	222	29.1
Rio Blanco	12	85.7	2	14.3
Rio Grande/Mineral	35	71.4	14	28.6
Routt	19	79.2	5	20.8
Saguache	7	100.0	0	0.0
Sedgwick	0	0.0	3	100.0
Summit	30	88.2	4	11.8
Teller	52	75.4	17	24.6
Washington	11	91.7	1	8.3
Weld	315	78.8	85	21.3
Yuma	32	86.5	5	13.5

*Baca, Custer, and Jackson counties had no eligible service episodes for this analysis.

3.2. Service Goal Attainment

The Core Services Program aims to keep children and their families together or, in cases where a child must be removed due to safety concerns, to return them home as quickly as possible, or maintain them in the least restrictive setting possible. The service goal attainment outcome is intended to determine whether each specific service intervention resulted in the child/youth achieving the intended service goal of either remain home, return home, or least restrictive setting. The unit of analysis for the service goal attainment outcome is per-child/youth and per-service. This means that each service episode within an involvement span for a distinct child/youth has a service goal attainment outcome associated with that service. The service goal is based on the overall Core goal defined at the start of the service. The following logic was used to determine whether the service goal was met for each goal type:

1. **Remain home** - service goal was achieved if child/youth did not have a removal from home during service episode or after service episode closed while case (or involvement for PA3) remained open.
2. **Return home and/or placement with kin** - service goal was achieved if child/youth either returned home to parents or permanent Allocation of Parental Rights (APR)/guardianship was granted to relatives based on removal end reason and/or living arrangement.
3. **Least restrictive setting** - service goal was achieved if: (1) permanency was achieved; (2) lower-level placement change occurred during or after the service episode; (3) same-level placement change occurred during or after the service episode; or (4) no change in placement during or after the service episode. Service goal was not achieved if there was a higher-level placement change during or after the service episode.

Children/youth may have multiple service episodes within the same service goal in addition to multiple service goals within the involvement span. There were 8,222 unduplicated children/youth with a closed case (or closed involvement for PA3) in CY 2014. There were 33,745 service episodes for these children/youth, which averages to approximately four service episodes per child/youth. It should be noted that these service episodes were not exclusively from CY 2014 but were provided during closed involvement spans in CY 2014.

3.2.1. Overall Service Goal Attainment Results

Table 15 shows the proportion of service episodes within closed involvement spans in CY 2014 by service goal type with 51% having a goal of remain home, 48% having a goal of return home, and 1% having a goal of the least restrictive setting.

80% of all children/youth attained their service goal.

Table 15: Service Goal Frequencies for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2014

Service Goal	Frequency	Percent
Remain Home	17,290	51.2
Return Home	16,021	47.5
Least Restrictive Setting	434	1.3
Total	33,745	100.0

As displayed in Table 16, the service type with the highest percentage of remain home service goals was day treatment at 60%, the service type with the highest percentage of return home service goals was mental health services at 58%, and the service type with the highest percentage of least restrictive setting service goals was day treatment at 8%.

Table 16: Service Type Frequencies by Service Goal for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2014

Service Type	Remain Home		Return Home		Least Restrictive Setting	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
County Designed	5,454	57.2	3,950	41.4	136	1.4
Day Treatment	191	59.7	104	32.5	25	7.8
Home-Based	2,253	56.9	1,656	41.8	52	1.3
Intensive Family Therapy	1,553	54.6	1,264	44.4	29	1.0
Life Skills	1,413	44.2	1,746	54.6	36	1.1
Mental Health Services	1,396	41.0	1,963	57.7	42	1.2
Sexual Abuse Treatment	381	54.4	280	39.9	40	5.7
Special Economic Assistance	2,211	51.2	2,049	47.5	58	1.3
Substance Abuse Treatment	2,438	44.6	3,009	55.1	16	0.3
Total	17,290	51.2	16,021	47.5	434	1.3

Table 17 shows that the service goal was attained in 80% of all service episodes. This represents a 1% increase in service goal attainment from CY 2013. The service goal attainment rate was 89% for remain home, 82% for least restrictive setting, and 70% for return home. In past reports, service goal attainment was measured at the time of service closure. To maintain consistency for this year’s report, the remain home service goal attainment rate also was calculated based on if the child/youth had an open removal on the day the service ended. Similar to last year’s findings, the remain home service goal was attained in 94% of service episodes. A third metric for this outcome is service goal attainment based on distinct children/youth. To calculate this rate, any child/youth with a service episode that did not attain the service goal was considered to not have achieved service goal attainment. Based on this definition, 86% of distinct children/youth with an involvement closed in CY 2014 attained their service goal.

Table 17: Service Goal Attainment by Service Goal Type for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2014

Service Goal	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Remain Home	15,346	88.8	1,944	11.2
Return Home	11,284	70.4	4,737	29.6
Least Restrictive Setting	355	81.8	79	18.2
Overall	26,985	80.0	6,760	20.0

To further explore service goal attainment outcomes, sub-analyses were conducted for provider type, program area, service type, and county for the remain home and return home groups. The least restrictive setting service goal was not included because of the small sample size. Chi-square tests were used to determine statistical significance for the provider type and program area analyses.

3.2.2. Remain Home Service Goal Attainment Results

Table 18 shows that county provided service episodes (91.3%) were significantly more likely ($p < .001$) to have a remain home service goal attainment than were purchased service episodes (87.1%).

Table 18: *Remain Home Service Goal Attainment by Provider Type for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2014*

Provider Type	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
County Provided	6,256	91.3	597	8.7
Purchased	9,090	87.1	1,347	12.9
Overall	15,346	88.8	1,944	11.2

As displayed in Table 19, service episodes for children/youth with a PA5 designation were significantly more likely ($p < .001$) to have a remain home service goal attainment than were service episodes for children/youth with a PA4 or PA6 designation. Service episodes for children/youth with a PA3 designation had a 99.3% service goal attainment rate. It should be noted that service goals are not identified when a prevention service is provided, but it is assumed that prevention is intended to keep children/youth in the home.

Table 19: *Remain Home Service Goal Attainment by Program Area for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2014*

Program Area	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
PA3 Services	133	99.3	1	0.7
PA4 Cases	1,655	72.6	624	27.4
PA5 Cases	13,522	91.2	1,306	8.8
PA6 Cases	36	73.5	13	26.5
Overall	15,346	88.8	1,944	11.2

Table 20 shows that service episodes for life skills (91%), county designed (91%), mental health (90%), intensive family therapy (90%), and special economic assistance (90%) had the highest remain home service goal attainment rates, while day treatment (70%) had the lowest remain home service goal attainment rates.

Table 20: *Remain Home Service Goal Attainment by Service Type for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2014*

Service Type	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Life Skills	1,288	91.2	125	8.8
County Designed	4,959	90.9	495	9.1
Mental Health	1,262	90.4	134	9.6
Intensive Family Therapy	1,401	90.2	152	9.8
Special Economic Assistance	1,991	90.0	220	10.0
Sexual Abuse Treatment	331	86.9	50	13.1
Home-based	1,939	86.1	314	13.9
Substance Abuse Treatment	2,042	83.8	396	16.2
Day Treatment	133	69.6	58	30.4
Overall	15,346	88.8	1,944	11.2

Table 21 shows the service goal attainment rates for services episodes with a remain home goal by county.

Table 21: *Remain Home Service Goal Attainment by County for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2014*

County*	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Statewide	15,346	88.8	1,944	11.2
Adams	1,728	92.6	138	7.4
Alamosa	121	84.0	23	16.0
Arapahoe	1,093	88.9	136	11.1
Archuleta	44	93.6	3	6.4
Baca	0	0.0	1	100.0
Bent	29	93.5	2	6.5
Boulder	478	84.8	86	15.2
Broomfield	61	91.0	6	9.0
Chaffee	17	54.8	14	45.2
Cheyenne	2	100.0	0	0.0
Clear Creek	16	100.0	0	0.0
Conejos	45	93.8	3	6.3
Costilla	32	100.0	0	0.0
Crowley	2	100.0	0	0.0
Delta	25	100.0	0	0.0
Denver	1,065	83.5	211	16.5
Douglas	223	91.4	21	8.6
Eagle	174	86.6	27	13.4
El Paso	2,942	85.6	493	14.4
Elbert	57	98.3	1	1.7
Fremont	630	91.2	61	8.8
Garfield	115	65.3	61	34.7
Gilpin	8	100.0	0	0.0
Grand	43	68.3	20	31.7
Gunnison/Hinsdale	18	94.7	1	5.3
Huerfano	32	88.9	4	11.1
Jackson	7	100.0	0	0.0
Jefferson	818	85.4	140	14.6
Kiowa	1	100.0	0	0.0
Kit Carson	12	66.7	6	33.3
La Plata/San Juan	437	98.4	7	1.6
Lake	46	95.8	2	4.2
Larimer	2,593	93.2	190	6.8
Las Animas	24	100.0	0	0.0
Lincoln	26	100.0	0	0.0
Logan	117	88.0	16	12.0
Mesa	204	84.0	39	16.0
Moffat	28	80.0	7	20.0
Montezuma	55	94.8	3	5.2
Montrose	118	93.7	8	6.3
Morgan	178	85.2	31	14.8
Otero	47	94.0	3	6.0
Ouray/San Miguel	31	100.0	0	0.0
Park	38	86.4	6	13.6
Phillips	8	100.0	0	0.0
Pitkin	19	100.0	0	0.0
Prowers	32	72.7	12	27.3
Pueblo	719	88.7	92	11.3
Rio Blanco	8	100.0	0	0.0
Rio Grande/Mineral	68	93.2	5	6.8
Routt	51	100.0	0	0.0
Saguache	15	100.0	0	0.0

Table 21 (continued)

County*	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Sedgwick	9	100.0	0	0.0
Summit	72	98.6	1	1.4
Teller	117	97.5	3	2.5
Washington	6	66.7	3	33.3
Weld	370	86.9	56	13.1
Yuma	72	97.3	2	2.7

* Custer and Dolores counties had no eligible service episodes for this analysis.

3.2.3. Return Home Service Goal Attainment Results

Table 22 shows county provided service episodes (73.3%) were significantly more likely ($p < .001$) to have a return home service goal attainment than were purchased service episodes (68.8%).

Table 22: *Return Home Service Goal Attainment by Provider Type for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2014*

Provider Type	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
County Provided	4,212	73.3	1,534	26.7
Purchased	7,072	68.8	3,203	31.2
Overall	11,284	70.4	4,737	29.6

As displayed in Table 23, service episodes for children/youth with a PA5 designation (71.4%) at time of service initiation were significantly more likely ($p < .001$) to have a return home service goal attainment than were children/youth with a PA4 designation (60.7%) or a PA6 designation (41.7%). In addition, service episodes for children/youth with a PA4 designation were significantly more likely ($p < .001$) to have a return home service goal attainment than were service episodes for children/youth with a PA6 designation.

Table 23: *Return Home Service Goal Attainment by Program Area for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2014*

Program Area	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
PA4 Cases	714	60.7	463	39.3
PA5 Cases	10,525	71.4	4,211	28.6
PA6 Cases	45	41.7	63	58.3
Overall	11,284	70.4	4,737	29.6

On the following page, Table 24 shows that service episodes for special economic assistance (76%) and life skills (73%) had the highest return home service goal attainment rates, while day treatment (59%) and mental health (63%) had the lowest return home service goal attainment rates.

Table 24: Return Home Service Goal Attainment by Service Type for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2014

Service Type	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Special Economic Assistance	1,558	76.0	491	24.0
Life Skills	1,268	72.6	478	27.4
County Designed	2,837	71.8	1,113	28.2
Home-based	1,188	71.7	468	28.3
Intensive Family Therapy	877	69.4	387	30.6
Substance Abuse Treatment	2,069	68.8	940	31.2
Sexual Abuse Treatment	188	67.1	92	32.9
Mental Health	1,238	63.1	725	36.9
Day Treatment	61	58.7	43	41.3
Overall	11,284	70.4	4,737	29.6

Table 25 shows the service goal attainment rates for services episodes with a return home goal by county.

Table 25: Return Home Service Goal Attainment by County for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2014

County*	Attained		Not Attained	
	Count	%	Count	%
Statewide	11,284	70.4	4,737	29.6
Adams	1,023	67.7	488	32.3
Alamosa	105	66.9	52	33.1
Arapahoe	766	69.4	338	30.6
Archuleta	20	80.0	5	20.0
Baca	4	100.0	0	0.0
Bent	21	67.7	10	32.3
Boulder	161	60.8	104	39.2
Broomfield	36	60.0	24	40.0
Chaffee	18	81.8	4	18.2
Cheyenne	10	100.0	0	0.0
Clear Creek	3	33.3	6	66.7
Conejos	9	69.2	4	30.8
Costilla	5	27.8	13	72.2
Crowley	6	100.0	0	0.0
Delta	53	82.8	11	17.2
Denver	1,415	61.8	874	38.2
Douglas	175	85.4	30	14.6
Eagle	42	56.0	33	44.0
El Paso	2,437	71.4	975	28.6
Elbert	62	100.0	0	0.0
Fremont	617	84.4	114	15.6
Garfield	43	86.0	7	14.0
Gilpin	4	100.0	0	0.0
Grand	11	25.0	33	75.0
Gunnison/Hinsdale	4	50.0	4	50.0
Huerfano	9	90.0	1	10.0
Jackson	3	100.0	0	0.0
Jefferson	729	65.3	388	34.7
Kiowa	10	100.0	0	0.0
Kit Carson	2	100.0	0	0.0
La Plata/San Juan	86	62.8	51	37.2
Lake	21	100.0	0	0.0
Larimer	964	76.6	294	23.4
Las Animas	44	74.6	15	25.4
Lincoln	13	100.0	0	0.0
Logan	54	55.1	44	44.9

Table 25 (continued)

County*	Attained		Not Attained	
	Count	%	Count	%
Mesa	285	61.8	176	38.2
Moffat	28	93.3	2	6.7
Montezuma	51	83.6	10	16.4
Montrose	73	82.0	16	18.0
Morgan	169	89.9	19	10.1
Otero	59	68.6	27	31.4
Park	8	40.0	12	60.0
Phillips	8	72.7	3	27.3
Pitkin	12	100.0	0	0.0
Prowers	22	95.7	1	4.3
Pueblo	941	75.2	310	24.8
Rio Blanco	19	86.4	3	13.6
Rio Grande/Mineral	28	66.7	14	33.3
Routt	8	100.0	0	0.0
Saguache	1	100.0	0	0.0
Sedgwick	1	100.0	0	0.0
Summit	8	80.0	2	20.0
Teller	53	58.9	37	41.1
Washington	5	62.5	3	37.5
Weld	505	73.9	178	26.1
Yuma	15	88.2	2	11.8

* Custer, Dolores, and Ouray/San Miguel counties had no eligible service episodes for this analysis.

3.3. Follow-up Outcomes

This outcome analysis is intended to provide one-year follow-up outcomes for children/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services whose case was closed in CY 2013 with the child/youth living with their parents (remain home or return home), and with a service episode that ended less than two years before the case end date. This analysis is on a per-child/youth, per-service basis and requires the case to be closed at least one year in order to provide the required follow-up time to measure subsequent child welfare involvement. To further explore follow-up outcomes, sub-analyses were conducted for provider type, service type, and county for the program area groups. Chi-square tests were used to determine statistical significance for the sub-analyses.

Children/youth that did not have an ending residence of living with parents (i.e., adoption, permanent custody/guardianship to relatives, emancipation, committed to DYC, transferred to Developmental Disabilities Services, moved out of State, walkaway) were not included in this analysis because, generally, they are not likely to experience follow-up events; or, if a follow-up event occurred, it would not involve the parents who were the original recipient of the Core Service. Service episodes with a service close reason of “assessment/evaluation only” were excluded unless for special economic assistance or for one of the following service types: (1) family group decision making; (2) mediation; (3) CET/TDM; (4) family empowerment. The service authorizations closed with an “assessment/evaluation only” reason that are not family meetings do not represent actual therapeutic interventions.

3.3.1. Overall Follow-Up Outcome Results

On the following page, Table 26 shows the overall follow-up outcomes for a distinct count of 5,678 children/youth with closed cases in CY 2013. Overall, 45% of children/youth had a subsequent referral, 31% had a subsequent assessment, 6% had a subsequent founded assessment, 12% had a subsequent case, 5% had a subsequent placement, 10% had a subsequent DYC placement (detention or commitment), and 2% had a subsequent DYC commitment. These outcomes are very similar to the follow-up outcomes for cases closed in CY 2012.

Less than 5% of children/youth had an out-of-home placement within one year of case closure.

Table 26: Frequency of Follow-up Events for Distinct Children/Youth from Closed Cases in CY 2013

Outcome	Frequency	Percent
Subsequent Referral (N = 5,678)		
Yes	2,537	44.7
No	3,141	55.3
Subsequent Assessment (N = 5,678)		
Yes	1,760	31.0
No	3,918	69.0
Subsequent Founded Assessment (N = 5,678)		
Yes	359	6.3
No	5,319	93.7
Subsequent Case (N = 5,678)		
Yes	662	11.7
No	5,016	88.3
Subsequent Placement (N = 5,678)		
Yes	275	4.8
No	5,403	95.2
Subsequent DYC Placement (N = 2,267)*		
Yes	216	9.5
No	2,051	90.5
Subsequent DYC Commitment (N = 2,267)*		
Yes	40	1.8
No	2,227	98.2

*The DYC outcomes were only measured for children/youth ages 10 and older at time of case closure.

3.3.2. Service Goal Follow-Up Outcome Results

Table 27 shows the proportion of service episodes within involvement spans for children/youth with closed cases in CY 2013 by service goal type. Of the 19,583 service episodes, 66% were associated with a goal of remain home, 34% with a goal of return home, and less than 1% with a goal of least restrictive setting.

Table 27: Service Goal Frequencies for Service Episodes from Cases Closed in CY 2013 (N = 19,583)

Service Goal	Frequency	Percent
Remain Home	12,941	66.1
Return Home	6,620	33.8
Least Restrictive Setting	22	0.1
Total	19,583	100.0

These findings, which are based on a service episode analysis for follow-up outcomes by service goal group, are shown on the following page in Table 28. Service episodes for children/youth with the least restrictive setting service goal were not included in the analysis because of the low sample size ($n = 22$).

- Children/youth with a remain home service goal (46.7%) were significantly less likely ($p < .001$) to have a subsequent referral than were children/youth with a return home service goal (49.9%).
- Children/youth with a remain home service goal (32.3%) were significantly less likely ($p < .001$) to have a subsequent assessment than were children/youth with a return home service goal (37.1%).
- Children/youth with a remain home service goal (7.4%) were significantly *more* likely ($p < .05$) to have a subsequent founded assessment than were children/youth with a return home service goal (6.6%).
- There was no difference between children/youth with a remain home service goal (11.2%) and children/youth with a return home service goal (11.7%) on subsequent case.

- Children/youth with a remain home service goal (4.3%) were significantly less likely ($p < .001$) to have a subsequent placement than were children/youth with a return home service goal (5.8%).
- Children/youth with a remain home service goal (8.4%) were significantly *more* likely ($p < .01$) to have a subsequent DYC placement than were children/youth with a return home service goal (6.1%).
- There was no difference between children/youth with a remain home service goal (1.1%) and children/youth with a return home service goal (1.2%) on subsequent DYC commitment.

Table 28: Frequency of Follow-up Events by Service Goal Group for Service Episodes from Closed Cases in CY 2013

Outcome	Frequency	Percent
Subsequent Referral		
Remain Home (N = 12,941)	6,042	46.7
Return Home (N = 6,620)	3,302	49.9
Subsequent Assessment		
Remain Home (N = 12,941)	4,184	32.3
Return Home (N = 6,620)	2,454	37.1
Subsequent Founded Assessment		
Remain Home (N = 12,941)	958	7.4
Return Home (N = 6,620)	435	6.6
Subsequent Case		
Remain Home (N = 12,941)	1,448	11.2
Return Home (N = 6,620)	773	11.7
Subsequent Placement		
Remain Home (N = 12,941)	554	4.3
Return Home (N = 6,620)	383	5.8
Subsequent DYC Placement*		
Remain Home (N = 5,063)	426	8.4
Return Home (N = 2,216)	136	6.1
Subsequent DYC Commitment*		
Remain Home (N = 5,063)	58	1.1
Return Home (N = 2,216)	27	1.2

*The DYC outcomes were only measured for children/youth ages 10 and older at time of case closure.

As displayed in Table 29, the follow-up outcomes by program area are based on service episodes from all cases closed in CY 2013. Service episodes for children/youth with a PA6 designation were not included in the analysis because of the low sample size ($n = 9$). In addition, prevention service episodes were not included because there were no closed PA3 involvements from CY 2013. There was no difference between the program areas on subsequent referral (referral) or subsequent assessment (assess). There were statistically significant differences ($p < .001$) between the program areas on subsequent founded assessment (founded) with PA5 having higher rates. There were statistically significant differences ($p < .001$) on subsequent case (case), placement (placed), DYC placement (any DYC), and DYC commitment (DYC commit) with PA4 having higher rates on all four of these follow-up outcomes.

Table 29: Percent of Service Episodes with Follow-up Events by Program Area from Cases Closed in CY 2013

Program Area	Sample Size	Referral	Assess	Founded	Case	Placed	Any DYC*	DYC Commit*
Statewide	19,583	47.8	33.9	7.1	11.4	4.8	7.7	1.2
PA4 Cases	1,687	46.5	33.7	2.4	17.3	8.8	23.1	4.3
PA5 Cases	17,887	47.9	34.0	7.6	10.8	4.4	3.3	0.3

*Sample size of 1,642 for PA4 and 5,653 for PA5. The DYC outcomes were only measured for children/youth ages 10 and older at time of case closure.

3.3.3. Program Area 4 Follow-Up Outcome Results

Table 30 shows the follow-up outcomes by provider type based on service episodes with a PA4 designation from all cases closed in CY 2013. There were no differences between county provided and purchased service delivery on any of the follow-up outcomes.

Table 30: *Percent of PA4 Service Episodes with Follow-up Events by Provider Type from Cases Closed in CY 2013*

Provider Type	Sample Size	Referral	Assess	Founded	Case	Placed	Any DYC*	DYC Commit*
Statewide	1,687	46.5	33.7	2.4	17.3	8.8	23.1	4.3
County Provided	552	49.3	35.0	2.4	18.7	7.2	22.5	3.8
Purchased	1,135	45.2	33.1	2.4	16.7	9.6	23.4	4.5
*Sample size of 533 for county provided and 1,109 for purchased								

Table 31 shows the follow-up outcomes by service type based on service episodes with a PA4 designation from all cases closed in CY 2013. Sexual abuse treatment service episodes had the lowest subsequent founded assessment, referral, assessment, case, placement, and any DYC placement, DYC commitment rates.

Table 31: *Percent of PA4 Service Episodes with Follow-up Events by Service Type from Cases Closed in CY 2013*

Service Type	Sample Size	Referral	Assess	Founded	Case	Placed	Any DYC*	DYC Commit*
Statewide	1,687	46.5	33.7	2.4	17.3	8.8	23.1	4.3
County Designed	584	47.1	32.7	2.2	16.8	6.7	23.6	3.8
Day Treatment	93	47.3	31.2	1.1	16.1	7.5	22.5	7.9
Home-Based	266	48.1	35.7	1.9	15.4	10.2	26.3	7.3
Intensive Family Therapy	145	51.7	37.2	4.1	17.2	9.0	23.9	4.9
Life Skills	96	39.6	32.3	3.1	14.6	4.2	18.3	4.3
Mental Health	163	41.1	25.8	3.7	17.2	10.4	19.6	1.3
Sexual Abuse Treatment	48	33.3	20.8	0.0	8.3	0.0	13.0	0.0
Special Economic Assistance	176	50.0	38.6	2.3	22.7	11.4	18.7	2.9
Substance Abuse Treatment	116	46.6	42.2	1.7	23.3	19.0	32.1	3.6
*Sample size of 577 for county designed, 89 for day treatment, 259 for home-based interventions, 142 for intensive family therapy, 93 for life skills, 153 for mental health services, 46 for sexual abuse treatment, 171 for special economic assistance, and 112 for substance abuse treatment								

On the following page, Table 32 shows that, statewide, 47% of service episodes associated with a PA4 designation had a subsequent referral, 34% had a subsequent assessment, 2% had a subsequent founded assessment, 17% had a subsequent case, 9% had a subsequent placement, 23% had a subsequent DYC placement, and 4% had a subsequent DYC commitment. The two DYC follow-up outcomes were only measured for children/youth ages 10 and older at time of case closure.

Table 32: Percent of PA4 Service Episodes with Follow-up Events by County from Cases Closed in CY 2013

County*	Sample Size	Referral	Assess	Founded	Case	Placed	Any DYC	DYC Commit
Statewide	1,687	46.5%	33.7%	2.4%	17.3%	8.8%	23.1%	4.3%
Adams	62	58.1%	46.8%	22.6%	30.6%	27.4%	35.5%	4.8%
Alamosa	27	85.2%	85.2%	0.0%	25.9%	0.0%	18.5%	0.0%
Arapahoe	120	30.8%	24.2%	0.0%	5.0%	1.7%	22.7%	6.7%
Archuleta	40	32.5%	22.5%	7.5%	25.0%	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%
Baca	5	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bent	7	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Boulder	84	52.4%	28.6%	0.0%	6.0%	3.6%	19.0%	6.0%
Broomfield	8	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Conejos	30	36.7%	36.7%	0.0%	40.0%	36.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Costilla	21	52.4%	52.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Crowley	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A
Delta	10	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Denver	160	59.4%	43.1%	1.9%	21.9%	16.9%	28.3%	6.9%
Dolores	10	30.0%	30.0%	10.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Douglas	57	26.3%	22.8%	0.0%	17.5%	3.5%	43.9%	0.0%
Eagle	6	50.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
El Paso	178	46.6%	34.3%	2.8%	20.8%	16.9%	20.3%	5.6%
Elbert	1	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fremont	25	40.0%	40.0%	0.0%	28.0%	0.0%	56.0%	0.0%
Garfield	19	26.3%	26.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	36.4%	0.0%
Gilpin	2	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Grand	3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Gunnison/ Hinsdale	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Huerfano	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Jackson	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Jefferson	85	60.0%	51.8%	0.0%	16.5%	15.3%	45.9%	8.2%
Kit Carson	11	63.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
La Plata/ San Juan	97	36.1%	16.5%	0.0%	13.4%	0.0%	6.2%	2.1%
Lake	3	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Larimer	169	48.5%	29.0%	0.0%	24.3%	8.3%	24.9%	0.6%
Logan	4	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Mesa	26	80.8%	65.4%	26.9%	23.1%	3.8%	16.7%	4.2%
Moffat	16	12.5%	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Montezuma	36	50.0%	27.8%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%
Montrose	28	32.1%	21.4%	7.1%	7.1%	0.0%	16.0%	0.0%
Morgan	29	82.8%	48.3%	0.0%	34.5%	34.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Otero	6	66.7%	66.7%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Ouray/ San Miguel	6	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Park	2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Prowers	4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pueblo	201	43.8%	37.8%	0.5%	17.4%	6.5%	30.9%	5.8%
Rio Blanco	3	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Rio Grande/ Mineral	6	16.7%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%
Routt	5	80.0%	80.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	80.0%
Saguache	2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Teller	13	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington	12	83.3%	75.0%	0.0%	75.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Weld	40	50.0%	22.5%	2.5%	7.5%	0.0%	40.0%	15.0%
Yuma	4	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	0.0%

* Chaffee, Cheyenne, Clear Creek, Custer, Kiowa, Las Animas, Lincoln, Phillips, Pitkin, Sedgwick, and Summit counties had no eligible service episodes for this analysis.

3.3.4. Program Area 5 Follow-Up Outcome Results

Table 33 shows the follow-up outcomes by provider type based on service episodes with a PA5 designation from all cases closed in CY 2013. There was no difference between county provided services and purchased services on subsequent referral, assessment, founded assessment, and DYC commitment. There were statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) between the provider types on subsequent case, placement, and DYC placement with county provided services having higher rates on these follow-up outcomes.

Table 33: Percent of PA5 Service Episodes with Follow-up Events by Provider Type from Cases Closed in CY 2013

Provider Type	Sample Size	Referral	Assess	Founded	Case	Placed	Any DYC*	DYC Commit*
Statewide	17,887	47.9	34.0	7.6	10.8	4.4	3.3	0.3
County Provided	6,792	48.0	34.3	7.6	14.0	5.2	4.1	0.4
Purchased	11,095	47.8	33.8	7.6	8.9	3.9	2.8	0.2

*Sample size of 2,146 for county provided and 3,507 for purchased

Table 34 shows the follow-up outcomes by service type based on service episodes with a PA5 designation from all cases closed in CY 2013. Sexual abuse treatment service episodes had the lowest subsequent referral, assessment, founded, case, and placement rates while mental health had the lowest DYC placement rates.

Table 34: Percent of PA5 Service Episodes with Follow-up Events by Service Type from Cases Closed in CY 2013

Service Type	Sample Size	Referral	Assess	Founded	Case	Placed	Any DYC*	DYC Commit*
Statewide	17,887	47.9	34.0	7.6	10.8	4.4	3.3	0.3
County Designed	4,589	47.9	32.8	5.9	13.1	3.8	6.0	0.8
Day Treatment	44	63.6	47.7	6.8	6.8	4.5	12.1	0.0
Home-Based	2,265	47.7	33.6	7.4	9.4	4.2	3.1	0.3
Intensive Family Therapy	1,534	46.9	32.0	6.8	8.4	3.3	1.6	0.2
Life Skills	1,559	53.1	39.6	9.6	10.5	5.3	1.6	0.0
Mental Health	2,116	48.9	34.9	7.2	9.8	3.6	1.2	0.0
Sexual Abuse Treatment	357	37.3	17.4	1.7	3.4	1.7	3.4	0.0
Special Economic Assistance	2,203	47.4	36.0	9.9	13.8	6.4	2.5	0.0
Substance Abuse Treatment	3,220	46.6	33.7	8.6	9.3	5.1	2.9	0.0

*Sample size of 1,444 for county designed, 33 for day treatment, 713 for home-based interventions, 568 for intensive family therapy, 448 for life skills, 724 for mental health services, 174 for sexual abuse treatment, 690 for special economic assistance, and 859 for substance abuse treatment

On the following page, Table 35 shows that, statewide, 48% of services episodes associated with PA5 designation had a subsequent referral, 34% had a subsequent assessment, 8% had a subsequent founded assessment, 11% had a subsequent case, 4% had a subsequent placement, 3% had a subsequent DYC placement, and less than 1% had a subsequent DYC commitment. The two DYC follow-up outcomes were only measured for children/youth ages 10 and older at time of case closure.

Table 35: Percent of PA5 Service Episodes with Follow-up Events by County from Cases Closed in CY 2013

County*	Sample Size	Referral	Assess	Founded	Case	Placement	Any DYC	DYC Commit
Statewide	17,887	47.9%	34.0%	7.6%	10.8%	4.4%	3.3%	0.3%
Adams	1,744	47.9%	39.8%	8.7%	7.2%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Alamosa	104	62.5%	62.5%	54.8%	46.2%	26.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Arapahoe	964	42.4%	30.2%	5.4%	7.7%	1.3%	2.2%	0.0%
Archuleta	7	28.6%	28.6%	14.3%	28.6%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Baca	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A
Bent	79	31.6%	29.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Boulder	468	63.7%	43.8%	10.5%	11.1%	5.1%	2.8%	0.0%
Broomfield	116	62.1%	37.1%	18.1%	18.1%	18.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Chaffee	17	11.8%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cheyenne	8	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A
Clear Creek	25	52.0%	44.0%	24.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Conejos	19	47.4%	47.4%	47.4%	47.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Costilla	29	31.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Crowley	8	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Custer	2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A
Delta	85	50.6%	24.7%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Denver	1,751	45.0%	32.1%	7.9%	10.4%	6.6%	3.0%	0.0%
Dolores	1	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A
Douglas	222	53.6%	36.0%	12.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Eagle	82	46.3%	45.1%	39.0%	46.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
El Paso	3,633	46.4%	29.6%	5.9%	5.8%	2.6%	2.2%	0.0%
Elbert	42	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%
Fremont	937	33.2%	21.9%	8.3%	15.5%	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Garfield	185	50.3%	50.3%	12.4%	7.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Gilpin	14	64.3%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Grand	41	82.9%	58.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Gunnison/ Hinsdale	37	21.6%	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Huerfano	27	74.1%	11.1%	7.4%	7.4%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Jefferson	1,768	53.5%	43.9%	6.2%	9.3%	5.1%	5.0%	0.0%
Kit Carson	31	32.3%	32.3%	22.6%	22.6%	22.6%	0.0%	0.0%
La Plata/ San Juan	160	64.4%	25.6%	1.9%	13.8%	8.8%	9.7%	0.0%
Lake	34	44.1%	17.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Larimer	2,318	48.7%	34.6%	4.1%	24.0%	4.1%	9.8%	1.6%
Las Animas	94	46.8%	44.7%	4.3%	4.3%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Lincoln	11	72.7%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Logan	204	45.1%	22.5%	5.9%	1.5%	0.0%	17.6%	0.0%
Mesa	400	52.5%	44.0%	7.0%	5.0%	3.5%	2.8%	2.8%
Moffat	25	12.0%	8.0%	8.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Montezuma	69	47.8%	44.9%	18.8%	21.7%	13.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Montrose	105	29.5%	20.0%	11.4%	14.3%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Morgan	241	68.5%	36.9%	27.4%	27.0%	17.8%	3.4%	0.0%
Otero	91	36.3%	17.6%	1.1%	11.0%	7.7%	5.3%	0.0%
Ouray/San Miguel	26	61.5%	61.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Park	22	72.7%	54.5%	22.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Phillips	13	46.2%	46.2%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pitkin	23	17.4%	13.0%	0.0%	13.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Prowers	27	48.1%	48.1%	14.8%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
Pueblo	684	45.0%	28.1%	5.3%	5.7%	4.1%	1.8%	0.0%
Rio Blanco	35	42.9%	34.3%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Rio Grande/ Mineral	34	44.1%	44.1%	11.8%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Routt	10	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 35 (continued)

County*	Sample Size	Referral	Assess	Founded	Case	Placement	Any DYC	DYC Commit
Saguache	30	80.0%	80.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Summit	86	52.3%	34.9%	34.9%	20.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Teller	102	30.4%	10.8%	4.9%	4.9%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington	6	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Weld	558	54.8%	37.5%	6.8%	6.1%	4.5%	1.8%	0.0%
Yuma	32	90.6%	40.6%	21.9%	43.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

* Jackson, Kiowa, and Sedgwick counties had no eligible service episodes for this analysis.

4. Costs of the Core Services Program

All Core Services costs were collected based on service dates within the calendar year regardless of date of payment; therefore these become costs for services provided in CY 2014. Pulling cost data based on date of payment rather than date of service will overstate costs, as sometimes counties pay for several months of service in a single payment month (based on timing of bill submissions).

In cases where services are provided directly by the county, there is not a direct link between costs and service episodes, meaning that per episode costs can only be calculated for purchased services. Specifically, county provided Core Service dollars are not evenly allocated across the Core Service types, there is no designation in the available data systems for how each county designates its county provided Core Service allocations into specific types of services, and not all service authorizations for county provided services are entered into Trails. However, cost per client and cost per child can be calculated for both purchased and county provided services. Furthermore, overall cost efficiency of the Core Services Program is calculated using cost data from both purchased and county provided services.

For counties that have shared Core Services contracts (fiscal agent counties in Trails), the expenditures were applied to the county that was responsible for the child/youth (based on Trails service authorization), not the fiscal agent county. For guaranteed payments issued without any authorized children/youth, the authorization county was set to the county that issued the payment.

As displayed in Table 36, the total Core Service expenditures were \$45,533,247 in CY 2014. Fee-for-service contract costs were \$24,441,425, which comprised 54% of total expenditures. Fixed-rate contract costs were \$6,999,107, which comprised 15% of total expenditures. County provided services costs were \$14,092,715, which comprised 31% of total expenditures.³ This represents a 3.0% increase in Core Services expenditures from CY 2013. The increase is primarily due to a 3% across-the-board increase in provider rates in CY 2014.

Table 36: Total Core Services Expenditures by Contract Type in CY 2014

Contract Type	Total	Percent
Fee-for-Service Contracts	\$24,441,425	53.7
Fixed-Rate Contracts	\$6,999,107	15.4
County Provided Services	\$14,092,715	30.9
Total Core Expenditures	\$45,533,247	100.0

4.1. Cost per Service Episode

The cost per service episode measure is intended to provide an overall average cost for each paid service intervention. This analysis only includes the costs for paid services (costs for no-pay services cannot be calculated

³ This number does not account for county salaried staff who directly provide Core Services and for whom service authorizations are not entered.

from Trails) and does not include the cost of county-provided services. As special economic assistance is a one-time service with a capped expenditure limit, it was not included in the cost per service episode analyses.

Based on service closure reasons, some Core Services are identified as service assessment/evaluation. To differentiate between therapeutic assessments and evaluations and actual therapeutic interventions, cost per service episode is calculated and reported separately for each. This information could be useful to counties in Core Services budgeting and planning given the difference in the duration, cost, and intent of assessments and evaluations as compared to service interventions.

Table 37 shows that the average cost per service episode for all therapeutic Core Service episodes closed in CY 2014 was \$2,294 with an average service duration of 129 days. This represents an increase of 5.2% or \$114 in average cost per service episode from CY 2013. For therapeutic assessments/evaluations, the average cost per service episode was \$607 with an average service duration of 35 days. For therapeutic interventions, the average cost per service episode was \$2,560 with an average service duration of 144 days.

Table 37: Average Cost per Service Episode and Average Service Duration (in days) for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2014

Service Category	Sample Size	Average Cost per Episode	Average Service Duration
Therapeutic Assessments/Evaluations	1,630	\$607	35
Therapeutic Interventions	10,347	\$2,560	144
All Therapeutic Services	11,977	\$2,294	129

The next set of tables display the descriptive results for cost per service episode and cost duration by service goal, program area, service type, and county. Statistical significance was not tested for these analyses. As displayed in Table 38, service episodes with a remain home service goal (\$529) had the lowest average cost per service episode for therapeutic assessments/evaluations, while service episodes with a return home service goal (\$2,239) had the lowest average cost per service episode for therapeutic interventions.

Table 38: Average Cost per Service Episode and Average Cost Duration (in days) by Service Goal for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2014

Service Goal	Therapeutic Assessments/Evaluations			Therapeutic Interventions		
	Sample Size	Cost	Duration	Sample Size	Cost	Duration
Statewide	1,630	\$607	35	10,347	\$2,560	144
Least Restrictive Setting	47	\$721	14	221	\$4,489	173
Remain Home	650	\$529	29	5,028	\$2,801	140
Return Home	933	\$656	40	5,098	\$2,239	148

As displayed in Table 39, service episodes with a PA5 designation had the lowest average cost per service episode for therapeutic assessments/evaluations (\$563) and for therapeutic interventions (\$2,281). Because prevention services are 100% voluntary, the cost per service episode for PA3 are not directly comparable with the other program areas.

Table 39: Average Cost per Service Episode and Average Cost Duration (in days) by Program Area for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2014

Program Area	Therapeutic Assessments/Evaluations			Therapeutic Interventions		
	Sample Size	Cost	Duration	Sample Size	Cost	Duration
Statewide	1,630	\$607	35	10,347	\$2,560	144
PA3 Services	2	\$185	2	131	\$1,244	63
PA4 Cases	231	\$865	39	2,349	\$3,399	131
PA5 Cases	1,360	\$563	34	7,694	\$2,281	149
PA6 Cases	37	\$653	20	173	\$4,599	175

As displayed in Table 40, home-based interventions had the highest average cost per service episode cost at \$932 for therapeutic assessments/evaluations, followed by mental health at \$906. For therapeutic interventions, day treatment had the highest average cost per episode at \$8,047 followed by sexual abuse treatment at \$4,512.

Table 40: Average Cost per Service Episode and Average Cost Duration (in days) by Service Type for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2014

Service Type	Therapeutic Assessments/Evaluations			Therapeutic Interventions		
	Sample Size	Cost	Duration	Sample Size	Cost	Duration
Statewide	1,630	\$607	35	10,347	\$2,560	144
County Designed	484	\$254	9	2,380	\$2,757	122
Day Treatment	--	--	--	239	\$8,047	153
Home-Based	188	\$932	5	2,022	\$3,697	128
Intensive Family Therapy	66	\$370	24	966	\$1,848	168
Life Skills	9	\$993	109	979	\$2,147	141
Mental Health	532	\$906	39	1,464	\$1,979	141
Sexual Abuse Treatment	152	\$833	23	309	\$4,512	227
Substance Abuse Treatment	199	\$253	123	1,988	\$1,170*	167

* The Office of Behavioral Health allocates approximately \$2.5 million in Additional Family Services (AFS) directly to Core Services substance abuse. These expenditures are tracked by the substance abuse Managed Service Organization (MSO). These funds are not reflected in the cost per service episode analysis for the substance abuse service type.

Table 41 shows the average cost per service episode and average service duration by county for all therapeutic services closed in CY 2014. Because of the small sample size for many counties, the average cost per service episode was not reported separately for therapeutic assessments/evaluations and therapeutic interventions.

Table 41: Average Cost per Service Episode and Average Service Duration (in Days) for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2014 by County

County*	Average Cost Per Episode	Average Service Duration	Sample Size
Statewide	\$2,294	129	11,977
Adams	\$2,741	103	1,048
Alamosa	\$2,350	197	109
Arapahoe	\$3,072	119	609
Archuleta	\$2,305	249	26
Baca	\$2,740	146	2
Bent	\$1,762	161	18
Boulder	\$5,818	254	380
Broomfield	\$2,882	116	76
Cheyenne	\$5,541	176	2
Clear Creek	\$3,970	232	16
Conejos	\$3,390	99	63
Costilla	\$2,456	196	17
Crowley	\$950	65	8
Delta	\$3,623	225	65
Denver	\$3,453	126	1,127
Douglas	\$2,975	135	272
Eagle	\$1,202	114	94
El Paso	\$1,681	119	3,511
Elbert	\$2,233	127	45
Fremont	\$2,765	163	98
Garfield	\$1,073	87	56
Gilpin	\$4,005	121	19
Grand	\$1,810	135	34
Gunnison/Hinsdale	\$840	92	1
Huerfano	\$3,261	400	6

Table 41 (continued)

County*	Average Cost Per Episode	Average Service Duration	Sample Size
Jackson	\$1,850	150	6
Jefferson	\$1,803	140	1,220
Kiowa	\$752	88	7
Kit Carson	\$2,845	247	3
La Plata/San Juan	\$4,677	194	99
Lake	\$1,538	178	7
Larimer	\$1,180	79	1,086
Las Animas	\$922	166	27
Lincoln	\$4,687	183	9
Logan	\$2,000	224	70
Mesa	\$1,013	158	483
Moffat	\$1,656	162	67
Montezuma	\$3,747	270	31
Montrose	\$4,060	258	39
Morgan	\$2,325	192	69
Otero	\$2,061	143	48
Ouray/San Miguel	\$677	54	4
Park	\$1,832	90	17
Phillips	\$1,591	142	7
Pitkin	\$1,475	136	17
Prowers	\$1,651	102	11
Pueblo	\$1,213	95	366
Rio Blanco	\$1,034	99	20
Rio Grande/Mineral	\$2,300	140	32
Routt	\$9,895	185	22
Saguache	\$3,854	229	11
Sedgwick	\$691	54	2
Summit	\$7,522	287	29
Teller	\$2,373	208	55
Washington	\$2,768	205	12
Weld	\$3,956	146	364
Yuma	\$1,297	115	35

* Chaffee, Custer and Dolores counties had no eligible service episodes for this analysis.

4.2. Cost per Client

The cost per client receiving services measure is intended to determine the overall average cost per client served using the overall number of clients who received Core Services at some point during the year (both adults and children/youth) and overall Core Service expenditures (both purchased and county provided). As displayed in Table 42, the average cost per client statewide for CY 2014 was \$1,761 based on total expenditures of \$45,533,247 and 25,856 clients served. This represents an increase of 6.9% or \$113 in average cost per client from CY 2013.

Table 42: Average Cost per Client by County in CY 2014

County	Expenditures	Clients Served*	Average Cost per Client
Statewide	\$45,533,247	25,856	\$1,761
Adams	\$4,213,883	2,413	\$1,746
Alamosa	\$383,992	241	\$1,593
Arapahoe	\$4,790,446	2,667	\$1,796
Archuleta	\$191,802	97	\$1,977
Baca	\$57,823	8	\$7,228
Bent	\$74,889	46	\$1,628
Boulder	\$2,431,624	708	\$3,434
Broomfield	\$278,746	99	\$2,816
Chaffee	\$150,557	34	\$4,428

Table 42 (continued)

County	Expenditures	Clients Served*	Average Cost per Client
Cheyenne	\$15,550	19	\$818
Clear Creek	\$83,585	47	\$1,778
Conejos	\$305,848	110	\$2,780
Costilla	\$103,690	57	\$1,819
Crowley	\$75,792	10	\$7,579
Custer	\$810	6	\$135
Delta	\$246,736	159	\$1,552
Denver	\$6,912,305	2,210	\$3,128
Dolores	\$13,556	2	\$6,778
Douglas	\$1,011,150	529	\$1,911
Eagle	\$187,507	173	\$1,084
El Paso	\$6,516,031	4,360	\$1,495
Elbert	\$155,645	81	\$1,922
Fremont	\$753,283	582	\$1,294
Garfield	\$161,513	186	\$868
Gilpin	\$93,673	49	\$1,912
Grand	\$111,358	87	\$1,280
Gunnison/Hinsdale	\$114,787	51	\$2,251
Huerfano	\$125,433	31	\$4,046
Jackson	\$13,765	8	\$1,721
Jefferson	\$3,504,376	1,679	\$2,087
Kiowa	\$31,488	14	\$2,249
Kit Carson	\$104,486	50	\$2,090
La Plata/San Juan	\$913,349	322	\$2,836
Lake	\$67,880	43	\$1,579
Larimer	\$2,589,401	3,041	\$851
Las Animas	\$236,370	94	\$2,515
Lincoln	\$184,628	44	\$4,196
Logan	\$413,045	238	\$1,735
Mesa	\$1,148,329	941	\$1,220
Moffat	\$250,712	130	\$1,929
Montezuma	\$268,030	71	\$3,775
Montrose	\$490,618	353	\$1,390
Morgan	\$469,135	301	\$1,559
Otero	\$259,582	120	\$2,163
Ouray/San Miguel	\$258,554	41	\$6,306
Park	\$92,358	53	\$1,743
Phillips	\$32,562	25	\$1,302
Pitkin	\$51,484	34	\$1,514
Prowers	\$263,678	126	\$2,093
Pueblo	\$1,227,319	1,309	\$938
Rio Blanco	\$26,517	42	\$631
Rio Grande/Mineral	\$141,098	111	\$1,271
Routt	\$210,568	53	\$3,973
Saguache	\$103,830	70	\$1,483
Sedgwick	\$27,031	5	\$5,406
Summit	\$186,750	98	\$1,906
Teller	\$278,197	133	\$2,092
Washington	\$64,426	52	\$1,239
Weld	\$1,948,384	1,041	\$1,872
Yuma	\$113,282	152	\$745

* The total does not match the overall sample size of distinct clients because clients could have had multiple involvements during the year with more than one county.

4.3. Cost per Child/Youth

The cost per child/youth receiving or benefitting from services is intended to determine the overall average cost per child/youth that received or benefitted from Core Services during the year. The measure includes all children/youth who directly received a Core Service as well as children/youth benefitting from a Core Service. As displayed in Table 43, the average cost per child/youth statewide for CY 2014 was \$2,926 based on total expenditures of \$45,533,247 and 15,563 children/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services. This represents an increase of 6.8% or \$186 in average cost per child/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services from CY 2013.

Table 43: Average Cost per Child/Youth by County in CY 2014

County	Expenditures	Child/Youth Receiving or Benefitting*	Average Cost per Child/Youth
Statewide	\$45,533,247	15,563	\$2,926
Adams	\$4,213,883	1,556	\$2,708
Alamosa	\$383,992	175	\$2,194
Arapahoe	\$4,790,446	1,656	\$2,893
Archuleta	\$191,802	61	\$3,144
Baca	\$57,823	6	\$9,637
Bent	\$74,889	31	\$2,416
Boulder	\$2,431,624	470	\$5,174
Broomfield	\$278,746	88	\$3,168
Chaffee	\$150,557	33	\$4,562
Cheyenne	\$15,550	8	\$1,944
Clear Creek	\$83,585	31	\$2,696
Conejos	\$305,848	63	\$4,855
Costilla	\$103,690	52	\$1,994
Crowley	\$75,792	14	\$5,414
Custer	\$810	4	\$203
Delta	\$246,736	107	\$2,306
Denver	\$6,912,305	1,537	\$4,497
Dolores	\$13,556	5	\$2,711
Douglas	\$1,011,150	279	\$3,624
Eagle	\$187,507	89	\$2,107
El Paso	\$6,516,031	2,156	\$3,022
Elbert	\$155,645	58	\$2,684
Fremont	\$753,283	399	\$1,888
Garfield	\$161,513	128	\$1,262
Gilpin	\$93,673	16	\$5,855
Grand	\$111,358	50	\$2,227
Gunnison/Hinsdale	\$114,787	25	\$4,591
Huerfano	\$125,433	41	\$3,059
Jackson	\$13,765	10	\$1,377
Jefferson	\$3,504,376	1,184	\$2,960
Kiowa	\$31,488	9	\$3,499
Kit Carson	\$104,486	24	\$4,354
La Plata/San Juan	\$913,349	220	\$4,152
Lake	\$67,880	22	\$3,085
Larimer	\$2,589,401	1,578	\$1,641
Las Animas	\$236,370	65	\$3,636
Lincoln	\$184,628	28	\$6,594
Logan	\$413,045	134	\$3,082
Mesa	\$1,148,329	594	\$1,933
Moffat	\$250,712	65	\$3,857
Montezuma	\$268,030	75	\$3,574
Montrose	\$490,618	178	\$2,756
Morgan	\$469,135	187	\$2,509

Table 43 (continued)

County	Expenditures	Child/Youth Receiving or Benefitting*	Average Cost per Child/Youth
Otero	\$259,582	90	\$2,884
Ouray/San Miguel	\$258,554	29	\$8,916
Park	\$92,358	25	\$3,694
Phillips	\$32,562	16	\$2,035
Pitkin	\$51,484	19	\$2,710
Prowers	\$263,678	75	\$3,516
Pueblo	\$1,227,319	780	\$1,573
Rio Blanco	\$26,517	17	\$1,560
Rio Grande/Mineral	\$141,098	67	\$2,106
Routt	\$210,568	33	\$6,381
Saguache	\$103,830	34	\$3,054
Sedgwick	\$27,031	6	\$4,505
Summit	\$186,750	44	\$4,244
Teller	\$278,197	67	\$4,152
Washington	\$64,426	24	\$2,684
Weld	\$1,948,384	626	\$3,112
Yuma	\$113,282	100	\$1,133

* The total does not match the overall sample size of distinct children/youth benefitting/receiving services because a child/youth could have had multiple involvements during the year with more than one county.

4.4. Cost Efficiency

The cost efficiency measure is intended to estimate the additional out-of-home placement costs that would be incurred by counties in lieu of providing Core Services to children/youth in the home or in OOH care. Overall cost efficiency was calculated using a methodology that assumes that all children/youth would have been placed in out-of-home care in the absence of Core Services. This analysis takes into account children/youth that were able to entirely avoid out-of-home placements by using Core Services, children/youth who were reunified in a shorter time frame by using Core Services, as well as children/youth who entered the least restrictive setting as a result of Core Services. The analysis also accounts for the expenditures for OOH days for children/youth that were not able to remain home. The cost efficiency methodology was as follows:

Without the Core Services Program, it is estimated that counties would have spent an additional \$52 million on out-of-home placements in CY 2014.

1. Determine the number of “involved days” for all children/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services during calendar year (service was open at some point in year). This number represents days in which a child/youth was involved in an open case in which Core Services were received. On average, a child/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services had 222 involved days in CY 2014.
2. For all children/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services, add all Core Services expenditures (including county provided) during year with all OOH placement expenditures incurred during year for these children/youth.
3. Divide total Core Services and OOH expenditures for children receiving or benefitting from Core Services from step 2 by total involved days from step 1 to get average actual cost per child/youth per involved day.
4. Derive an average OOH cost per day from all OOH expenditures (including “no-pay” kinship placements) during year divided by the total number of OOH days for all children/youth in the year - this is the overall average cost per OOH day.
5. Compare the average daily OOH cost from step 4 to the total average Core Services and OOH costs per child/youth per involved day to get an average cost difference per involved day.
6. Multiply the total number of involved days (from step 1) by the average cost difference per involved day (from step 5) to get overall cost efficiency.

7. Divide the average cost difference per involved day by average actual cost per involved day to get a cost efficiency ratio, with higher ratios indicating greater cost efficiency. For example, a ratio of 1.0 indicates that for every dollar spent on Core Services and OOH placements, one dollar was not spent on additional OOH care.

Based on actual expenditures of \$109,742,027 and an estimated cost of \$161,257,088, an additional **\$51,515,061** would have been spent by county agencies statewide in CY 2014 if OOH placements had been provided exclusively instead of a combination of Core Services and OOH placements. This equates to an additional \$15 per child/youth per involved day and represents a cost efficiency ratio of .48 statewide. Table 44 shows the average cost difference per involved day, the overall cost efficiency, and the cost efficiency ratio by county for CY 2014.

Table 44: *Estimated Core Services Cost Efficiency by County for CY 2014*

County	Number of Involved Days	Average Cost per OOH Day	Average Cost per Involved Day	Average Cost Difference per Involved Day	Overall Cost Efficiency	Cost Efficiency Ratio
Adams	354,474	\$44.42	\$29.18	\$15.24	\$5,402,300	.52
Alamosa	42,108	\$34.55	\$20.01	\$14.54	\$612,281	.73
Arapahoe	379,030	\$44.72	\$34.21	\$10.51	\$3,984,290	.31
Archuleta	12,355	\$36.45	\$25.88	\$10.56	\$130,477	.41
Baca	1,619	\$94.70	\$112.21	-\$17.51	-\$28,353	-.16
Bent	5,262	\$47.86	\$31.60	\$16.25	\$85,525	.51
Boulder	106,604	\$54.98	\$41.50	\$13.49	\$1,437,581	.32
Broomfield	20,990	\$63.35	\$28.40	\$34.95	\$733,625	1.23
Chaffee	6,850	\$48.45	\$44.40	\$4.05	\$27,744	.09
Cheyenne	1,785	\$7.32	\$10.45	-\$3.13	-\$5,579	-.30
Clear Creek	7,424	\$43.37	\$37.35	\$6.02	\$44,690	.16
Conejos	14,447	\$33.85	\$23.90	\$9.95	\$143,678	.42
Costilla	13,171	\$72.89	\$17.31	\$55.57	\$731,972	3.21
Crowley	3,112	\$52.03	\$67.93	-\$15.90	-\$49,480	-.23
Custer	1,203	\$129.24	\$23.45	\$105.79	\$127,269	4.51
Delta	26,484	\$69.95	\$42.42	\$27.53	\$729,161	.65
Denver	358,749	\$38.38	\$39.41	-\$1.03	-\$369,170	-.03
Dolores	1,265	\$6.42	\$12.18	-\$5.76	-\$7,285	-.47
Douglas	70,606	\$92.81	\$38.57	\$54.24	\$3,829,611	1.41
Eagle	16,073	\$87.30	\$18.99	\$68.31	\$1,097,946	3.60
El Paso	472,488	\$42.34	\$32.89	\$9.45	\$4,464,519	.29
Elbert	11,631	\$89.77	\$41.61	\$48.16	\$560,206	1.16
Fremont	77,075	\$49.04	\$26.78	\$22.26	\$1,715,877	.83
Garfield	30,963	\$72.80	\$22.99	\$49.81	\$1,542,203	2.17
Gilpin	4,634	\$102.53	\$68.53	\$34.00	\$157,552	.50
Grand	8,525	\$50.44	\$28.29	\$22.15	\$188,795	.78
Gunnison/ Hinsdale	3,881	\$45.74	\$38.81	\$6.93	\$26,889	.18
Huerfano	7,526	\$57.81	\$25.97	\$31.84	\$239,618	1.23
Jackson	1,294	\$46.94	\$10.64	\$36.30	\$46,976	3.41
Jefferson	276,236	\$49.32	\$34.94	\$14.39	\$3,974,215	.41
Kiowa	1,570	\$22.28	\$35.42	-\$13.14	-\$20,628	-.37
Kit Carson	6,897	\$31.61	\$25.36	\$6.25	\$43,110	.25
La Plata/ San Juan	38,857	\$44.24	\$26.92	\$17.32	\$672,920	.64
Lake	3,576	\$68.75	\$38.24	\$30.50	\$109,073	.80
Larimer	307,590	\$16.66	\$12.41	\$4.25	\$1,307,594	.34
Las Animas	13,560	\$38.52	\$42.59	-\$4.06	-\$55,101	-.10
Lincoln	7,002	\$96.63	\$58.04	\$38.59	\$270,213	.66
Logan	34,970	\$62.35	\$27.31	\$35.04	\$1,225,349	1.28
Mesa	150,708	\$65.03	\$43.22	\$21.80	\$3,286,179	.50
Moffat	18,393	\$57.22	\$18.47	\$38.75	\$712,668	2.10
Montezuma	15,403	\$81.65	\$33.38	\$48.27	\$743,487	1.45

Table 44 (continued)

County	Number of Involved Days	Average Cost per OOH Day	Average Cost per Involved Day	Average Cost Difference per Involved Day	Overall Cost Efficiency	Cost Efficiency Ratio
Montrose	42,842	\$93.68	\$44.06	\$49.62	\$2,125,981	1.13
Morgan	41,152	\$68.74	\$30.35	\$38.40	\$1,580,053	1.27
Otero	19,893	\$33.81	\$29.17	\$4.65	\$92,448	.16
Ourray/ San Miguel	4,268	\$89.90	\$65.91	\$23.99	\$102,372	.36
Park	6,827	\$89.44	\$59.21	\$30.23	\$206,386	.51
Phillips	3,581	\$19.86	\$13.21	\$6.65	\$23,805	.50
Pitkin	3,829	\$131.07	\$40.24	\$90.83	\$347,784	2.26
Prowers	15,181	\$58.30	\$30.30	\$28.00	\$425,092	.92
Pueblo	166,430	\$32.06	\$24.49	\$7.57	\$1,260,172	.31
Rio Blanco	3,227	\$49.57	\$34.74	\$14.83	\$47,850	.43
Rio Grande/ Mineral	15,201	\$107.14	\$27.04	\$80.10	\$1,217,660	2.96
Routt	6,887	\$23.83	\$32.92	-\$9.09	-\$62,625	-.28
Saguache	8,205	\$21.94	\$14.53	\$7.41	\$60,792	.51
Sedgwick	398	\$168.46	\$67.92	\$100.54	\$40,016	1.48
Summit	9,645	\$107.09	\$36.44	\$70.65	\$681,406	1.94
Teller	13,660	\$62.10	\$43.34	\$18.76	\$256,248	.43
Washington	5,722	\$47.63	\$28.32	\$19.31	\$110,479	.68
Weld	131,089	\$53.75	\$37.20	\$16.55	\$2,170,068	.45
Yuma	13,970	\$87.06	\$18.41	\$68.65	\$959,077	3.73

5. Family Preservation Commission Report Findings

As mandated by C.R.S. 19.1.116, Core Services Coordinators from each county were asked to complete a web-based version of the Family Preservation Commission Report in coordination with their Family Preservation Commission. The purpose of the report is to provide context to the descriptive, outcome, and cost results from the Core Services evaluation. Coordinators were asked to respond to the availability, capacity, accessibility, and delivery of Core Services, program changes, collaboration with service providers and community stakeholders, funding of Core Services, and recommendations for the enhancement of the Core Services Program.

5.1. Service Availability, Capacity, and Accessibility

Overall, 80% of counties agreed or strongly agreed that the **availability** of Core Services in their community is adequate to address the needs of children, youth, and families. However, 62% agreed or strongly agreed that there are specific services needed in their county that are not currently available. These services include: day treatment (58%), sexual abuse treatment (37%), county designed services (34%) based on lack of resources, substance abuse treatment (29%), intensive family therapy (21%), life skills (16%), mental health services (11%), home-based interventions (11%), and special economic assistance (3%). For example, one coordinator commented that, “Our Department does not have Day Treatment in the county, so we must look elsewhere.”

Similarly, 82% of counties agree or strongly agree that the **capacity** of Core Services in their community is adequate to address the needs of children, youth, and families. However, 38% reported that not all services were available at an adequate capacity. These services include: mental health services (54%), substance abuse treatment (46%), home-based services (38%), sexual abuse treatment (38%), day treatment (33%), intensive family therapy (25%), life skills (21%), county designed services (17%), and special economic assistance (4%).

Overall, 80% of counties agreed or strongly agreed that the availability and capacity of their Core Services program is adequate to address the needs of children, youth, and families.

As stated by one coordinator, “Mental health services and substance abuse treatment have problems in regards to capacity, especially for play therapy and in treating children younger than 10 years of age.” Another coordinator noted that, “The capacity issues primarily apply to our outlying rural areas. We continue to work with providers to extend services, but the ability of providers to strongly serve in the rural areas is extremely limited.”

Counties are actively addressing service capacity issues. For example, “There have been conversations with partners and collaborators that have resulted in the identification of the gaps that are present in our community. These identified gaps have been shared with our local provider network.” Coordinators shared the following steps being taken to improve service capacity in their counties:

1. Communicating with community partners
2. Working with providers on appointments and waiting lists
3. Evaluating the peaks in service demand
4. Working to get more trained clinicians
5. Finding ways to be more creative with financing

When asked about service accessibility, 45% of counties reported that there are barriers to accessing services that are available and have adequate capacity. Specifically, coordinators indicated that there are barriers to accessing mental health services (78%), substance abuse treatment (70%), sexual abuse treatment (52%), day treatment (45%), intensive family therapy (33%), county designed services (30%), home-based interventions (30%), life skills (22%), and special economic assistance (7%).

Transportation was mentioned as the most frequent barrier when services are not provided in the home. According to one coordinator, “When a youth needs Day Treatment they are bused to the program and back (which takes at least an hour and a half). This poses challenges for the youth and increases the risk of behavioral concerns.” The second most common barrier is staff and therapist turnover at service providers. As stated by a coordinator, “Our mental health agency is under staffed, therefore, not able to provide the services that we need. When we do have a client that goes to them, the wait time to be seen is too extensive and we have to find another provider in order to get our clients back on track and maintain stability for their children.” The third most common barrier is serving clients receiving Medicaid in regard to denial of services, low reimbursement rates, and waitlists. For one county, “Children who have Medicaid are not able to receive complex and client-centered services, and more specifically are not able to receive trauma focused assessments.” Other barriers include obtaining funding approval for services and engaging families in the treatment process.

Again, counties are actively trying to resolve service barriers. For example, “Monthly meetings are held with the local substance abuse and mental health center therapists to discuss client progress and attendance to treatment. There are also monthly meetings with program administrators to discuss systematic barriers or ongoing issues.” Coordinators offered the following strategies to address barriers to service accessibility in their counties:

1. Finding appropriate funding for transportation programs (e.g., bus passes, gas money)
2. Strengthening collaborations and partnerships with providers through open dialogue and meetings
3. Offering more in-home services
4. Developing county designed services
5. Utilizing out-of-county providers
6. Increasing family engagement meetings

5.2. Service Delivery

The next section of the report asked coordinators to reflect on the delivery of Core Services in their county. Overall, coordinators expressed satisfaction with their service delivery and mentioned the following components that were working especially well:

“Core Service delivery works well in our county as we are able to quickly meet the needs of any child or family for prevention or family preservation.”

1. Collaboration
2. Good relationships with providers
3. Prevention services
4. Menu of providers
5. Wide array of services
6. No wait lists
7. Availability of private providers
8. Tailored services/creativity with services
9. Intensive in-home services
10. Quickly meeting family needs
11. County designed services
12. Seamless referral process
13. Use of best practices/evidence-based practices

When asked what is not working well with service delivery, the following challenges were mentioned in order of frequency: (1) need for more practitioners/therapists, (2) lack of transportation to services, (3) inconsistency with mental health providers; (4) lack of Medicaid providers; and (5) limited funding/resources to serve all families. These challenges are especially pressing in rural counties. As stated by one coordinator, “There are many problems with the rural communities not having the services that are required to treat the clients that we have in our care, as well as the clients that might receive in home services to keep the children and parents together.”

Coordinators also were asked if there were differences in service delivery based on the populations being served. Although most noted that there were no differences, others indicated that there were challenges providing Core Services to: families with substance abuse issues, PA4 youth, Spanish speaking families, and youth in out-of-home placement settings. For example, one coordinator commented, “Prevention, in-home services, and mental health systems would be strengthened by the ability to offer services in Spanish, which is the largest second language spoken in our community.” Some coordinators reported that there were strengths providing prevention and in-home services to children/youth with a service goal of remain home, as well as to children/youth in community placements.

Coordinators also were asked to describe any programmatic or policy changes to the Core Services program that may have impacted the decrease in their county’s OOH placement rate or OOH length of stay. The most frequently reported changes were the rise in kinship care placements, an increase in family meetings, and a shift in agency philosophy toward greater family engagement. Coordinators noted other practice changes including the use of external service providers, and the implementation of front-loaded, in-home, and county designed services. From a policy perspective, coordinators indicated that the Collaborative Management Program, IV-E waiver interventions (Family Engagement, Kinship Supports, Permanency Roundtables, and Trauma Informed Screening, and Assessment), and prevention programs positively impacted OOH placement rates and length of stay. In addition, several coordinators mentioned that court intervention giving “youth in conflict” cases to the Department of Human Services has increased residential placements in their counties.

“The culture within our agency has radically changed and more efforts are being made to provide front loaded services versus more intrusive interventions (e.g., removal). We are practicing many components of Differential Response and as such are doing a better job of identifying resources (both formal and informal) to ameliorate child maltreatment risks before they become safety concerns.”

5.3. Service Collaboration

Table 45 shows that the most prevalent collaborative effort from July 2013 to December 2014 was the Collaborative Management Program at 62%, followed by the Nurse-Family Partnership at 60%, Promoting Safe and Stable Families at 57%, and other collaborative efforts at 53%, which included the IV-E Waiver interventions, partnerships with local school districts and courts (e.g., drug court, Crossover Youth Practice model), Systems of Care, DR, and Early Childhood Councils.

Table 45: *Participation in Collaborative Efforts from July 2013 to December 2014 (N = 60)*

Program Area	Frequency	Percent*
Collaborative Management Program	37	61.7
Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP)	36	60.0
Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF)	34	56.7
Other Collaborative Efforts	32	53.3
SafeCare Colorado (SCC)	29	48.3
Collaborative Efforts with Family to Family Principles	26	43.3
Colorado Community Response (CCR)	19	31.7
Family to Family	8	13.3
No Collaborative Efforts	3	5.0

*The overall percent does not equal 100%, as respondents were able to select more than one option.

Coordinators were asked to describe how their collaborative efforts may have impacted the service effectiveness and service goal attainment outcomes for the Core Services Program. The most frequently reported impacts were an increase in family meetings, improved communication and service coordination, and the diversity of the service array. Although a few coordinators think it is too early to determine the impact of these collaborative efforts, others mentioned that an enhanced focus on family needs, improved service delivery, quicker access to services, in-home service options, blended funds, and progress monitoring arising from these partnerships have all positively impacted service effectiveness and service goal attainment rates.

“Through collaboration we are able to reduce duplication of services and assure adequate service design and delivery. By having services designed by the community we are able to provide services to meet the needs of the families rather than expect families to fit within the service. It is our belief that this approach results in better outcomes.”

5.4. Service Funding

The next section of the report inquired about Core Services funding in each county. In response to a question about types of Core Service contracts, 56% of counties reported utilizing fixed-rate agreements. This perception is supported by data from Trails, as 63% of counties actually used fixed-rate contracts in CY 2014. This is likely driven by rural counties who use fixed-rate contracts as a means to maintain the sustainability of their providers. This is supported by reported concerns about the unpredictability of Core Services demand. For those counties that have fixed-rate contracts, it is used at varying rates for the following Core Services types: substance abuse treatment (64%), mental health services (39%), county designed services (39%), home-based services (24%), day treatment

“The ability to use Core Services funding for county designed programs has proven very beneficial. This allows us to identify a need and respond to it in a way the benefits our community.”

(24%), intensive family therapy (18%), sexual abuse treatment (18%), and life skills (15%). Some counties reported that fee-for-service works better while others contend that fixed-rate works better. This varying perspective is explained by the following quote, “The county’s ability to determine which payment schedule is utilized allows the county to determine how to most efficiently provide services to families based on the individualized needs of the county.” Overall, the majority of counties expressed satisfaction with how Core Services are funded.

There is a difference of opinion, however, regarding the benefits and challenges of specific Core Services funding areas. As displayed in Table 46, some coordinators appreciate the flexibility afforded them in spending Core Services dollars while other coordinators would like even more flexibility. While some coordinators see benefits to contracting for prevention services, others see challenges in contracting for mental health services and substance abuse treatment, especially in rural communities. Furthermore, some coordinators believe the allocation formula is equitable and report receiving larger allocations, while other coordinators suggest that the allocation formula can be approved and report receiving smaller allocations.

Table 46: *Benefits and Challenges to Core Services Funding from July 2013 to December 2014*

Funding Areas	Benefits	Challenges
Flexibility	Core dollars can be spent in different ways	Limitations/restrictions to how Core dollars can be used
Accessibility	Ability to contract for prevention services	Difficulty in contracting for mental health services and substance abuse treatment
Allocation	Equitable allocation formula Allocation is getting larger	Allocation formula can to be improved Allocation is getting smaller

Lastly, coordinators were asked to provide recommendations for the funding of the Core Services Program. The most common suggestions were to: (1) increase funding overall and for county designed services; (2) allow for more spending flexibility; (3) evaluate the effective use of Medicaid funds (e.g., assess the management of Medicaid funds for children in foster care by Behavioral Health Organizations); and (4) review the Core Services allocation formula. Other recommendations included being more creative with transportation funding, allocating funds prior to contract fiscal year, helping fund treatment facility construction, and tracking all service expenditures regardless of funding source in Trails.

6. Conclusions and Implications

The conclusions of the Core Services Program Evaluation CY 2014 Report summarize the key findings from the outcome and cost evaluations and the Family Preservation Commission Report. Implications for county and state policy and practice for the Core Services Program are discussed in the context of the limitations of the evaluation design and methodology.

6.1. Conclusions

The following conclusions highlight that the Core Services Program is cost efficient and effective for children, youth, and families in Colorado.

The Core Services Program is Working as Designed. The findings from this report support the Core Services Program as an effective approach to strengthening Colorado families by keeping or returning children/youth home or in the least restrictive setting while maintaining safety. For example, at involvement closure, 99% of children/youth who received PA3 services remained home. The Core Services Program is clearly serving the population targeted by the legislation and is providing the appropriate levels of support, as evidenced by the findings that less than 5% of children/youth had a subsequent placement after receiving or benefiting from Core Services.

“Recognizing the strengths and motivation of the families we work with assists in bridging the gap between what the Department wants for a family and what the family wants for themselves.”

Core Services are Effective in Achieving Treatment Success. Approximately 80% of all service episodes in CY 2014 were determined to be successful or partially successful with 95% of PA3 service episodes determined to be as such. Sexual abuse treatment had the highest percentage of episodes closed with either a successful or partially

successful designation. Furthermore, 80% of counties reported that the availability and capacity of their Core Services program is adequate to address the needs of children, youth, and families.

Core Services Facilitate Service Goal Attainment. The service goal was attained by 80% of children/youth with an involvement closed in CY 2014. Similar to past reports, the remain home service goal was attained in 94% of service episodes when calculated based on if the child/youth had an open removal on the day the service ended. Life skills and county designed services had the highest remain home service goal attainment rates, while special economic assistance and life skills had the highest return home service goal attainment rate. County provided services and service episodes for children/youth with a PA5 designation were significantly more likely to have service goal attainment for remain and return home service goals than were purchased services and services episodes for children/youth with a PA4 designation. In addition, Core Services coordinators reported that an increase in family meetings, improved communication and service coordination, and the diversity of the service array resulting from collaborative efforts positively impacted service goal attainment outcomes.

Core Services Impacts Subsequent Child Welfare Involvement. For children/youth with a closed case in CY 2013, 45% had a subsequent referral, 31% had a subsequent assessment, 6% had a subsequent founded assessment, 12% had a subsequent case, 5% had a subsequent placement, 10% had a subsequent DYC placement (detention or commitment), and 2% had a subsequent DYC commitment. The two DYC follow-up outcomes were only measured for children/youth ages 10 and older at time of case closure.

Core Services Provide Substantial Cost Efficiency for Colorado. Without the Core Services Program, it is estimated that Colorado counties would have spent an additional \$52 million in CY 2014 on out-of-home placements for children/youth. Over the past two calendar years, an additional \$120 million would have been spent by county agencies statewide if OOH placements had been provided exclusively instead of a combination of Core Services and OOH placements. This figure is based on children/youth who were able to entirely avoid OOH placements by using Core Services, children/youth who were reunified in a shorter time frame by using Core Services, as well as children/youth who entered the least restrictive setting as a result of Core Services. The cost efficiency measure also takes into account the expenditures for OOH days for children/youth that were not able to remain home. Core Services Coordinators also noted that the use of external service providers and the implementation of front-loaded, in-home, and county designed services positively impacted the decrease in OOH placement rates and OOH lengths of stay.

6.2. Limitations

For the second year, this report represents an advancement in the evaluation of the Core Services program in several ways. First, the merging of service authorizations into service episodes provides a unit of analysis that more closely resembles the practice of Core Services, in that episodes represent an uninterrupted span of service or treatment. Second, additional follow-up outcomes allow for a better understanding of the relationship between Core Services and subsequent child welfare involvement. Third, new methodology was employed to calculate cost per service episode, client, and child/youth, while the cost efficiency of the program was quantified at both the state and county levels. However, these advancements must be considered in light of several limitations that challenge the Core Services Program in regard to better understanding its impact on child welfare outcomes and costs in Colorado.

The primary limitation of the Core Services Program evaluation is that there are competing interventions, service population differences, and county-specific contexts that are not accounted for in the analyses. These potentially confounding factors may be related to overall outcomes or outcome differences and are hard to control without a rigorous experimental research design. Given the breadth, scope, and complexity of the Core Services Program, it is not practical to attempt a randomized controlled trial, for example, which would allow for causal statements to be made about the *effect* of the Core Services Program on child outcomes and system costs. Stated another way, while the positive and consistent outcomes from this year and previous years' reports support conclusions that the program is effective and cost efficient, it is not clear whether these positive outcomes are solely due to the Core Services Program. Other limitations include variations in data entry procedures and service delivery across

counties. Even with these limitations, this report presents the best available data with the most appropriate analyses to evaluate the impact of the Core Services Program.

6.3. Implications

Based on the outcome and cost evaluation findings, the key implication is that the Core Services Program is an essential component of the continuum of care in Colorado. Core Services are especially effective for county provided services and for children/youth with a service goal of remain home or a PA5 designation. As a result, increased efforts to improve outcomes for purchased services and for children/youth with a service goal of return home or a PA4 designation are warranted.

The Core Services Program is an essential component of the continuum of care in Colorado.

Although the positive findings for service effectiveness and service goal attainment are preliminary, it appears that current Core Service prevention efforts should be enhanced and offered widely to families at risk for child welfare involvement to maximize the opportunity for lowering case numbers and stepping down children/youth to lower levels of care. The Core Services Program also aligns well with other child welfare prevention efforts recently implemented in the state. As such, future evaluation efforts should look across the prevention/intervention array to identify common metrics of outcome, cost, and process effectiveness to provide the state and counties with a holistic understanding of how prevention programs work together to promote the safety, permanency, and well-being of children, youth, and families in Colorado. This effort commenced with the collection of baseline outcomes for this year's report and will continue in next year's report with the analysis of follow-up outcomes for children/youth who received PA3 services in CY 2014.

Colorado remains a national leader by investing heavily in therapeutic systems and by tracking the associated services, outcomes, and costs in SACWIS so that policy and program decisions can be informed by timely and consistent data. To facilitate the cutting-edge use of administrative data to support practice innovations, continued enhancements to Trails should be considered to more efficiently collect, enter, and access data regarding service delivery, costs, and outcomes. In addition, counties should be engaged through ongoing training and consultation opportunities to make full use of the available data for quality improvement purposes. Finally, counties should be encouraged to consult with one another to identify promising practices, evidence-based services, and areas of collaboration for enhancing their Core Services Programs.

Appendix A

Core Services Program Evaluation Methods

Outcome Datasets - General Considerations

In the Colorado Trails data system, Core Services are entered as “service authorizations.” The service authorization records dates of service, the goal of the service (remain home, return home, or other), the client(s) receiving the service, the county responsible for the child/youth, the agency or individual providing the service (provider), the type of service, and whether the service is being paid for from Trails. Service authorizations must be recorded on behalf of a child/youth but, when entering Core Services in Trails, caseworkers must also specify the client(s) who are actually receiving the service which may be parents/guardians or children. In addition, when the service authorization is closed, outcome information is entered to track the degree to which the service was successful in achieving the Core Service goal.

Service Authorization Adjustments

To provide consistent, accurate, and comparable Core Service descriptive and outcome information statewide, the following adjustments were made to the Trails service authorization data.

- Individual Trails service authorization records were merged into “service episodes”
 - Some counties have a practice of closing and re-opening service authorizations each month or opening separate service authorizations for the periods in which services are authorized. Therefore, multiple service authorizations in Trails would exist for a single uninterrupted episode of service/treatment. If this data entry practice is not accounted for, then both the per-service costs and service-level outcomes will be inaccurate. To account for this, service authorizations were merged when needed to create an adjusted service episode. The service episode was created by merging individual service authorizations open any time during the calendar year within the same case, for the same provider and service type, and for the same set of clients receiving the service, as long as there was not a gap in service dates of more than 30 consecutive days. This adjusted service episode provides a more accurate representation of the duration, cost, and outcome of core service interventions.
- Service authorizations that did not represent actual service interventions were excluded according to the following criteria:
 - Service authorizations closed with an ‘Opened in Error’ or ‘Payee Wrong Code’ reason and for which no services were paid were removed.
 - ‘Yes-Pay’ service authorizations without payment details were excluded unless service was provided by the county department.
 - ‘No-Pay’ service authorizations for services not performed by the county department were included, as these are typically used to document blended funding services such as Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF).
- Program Area was determined based on the goal that was in place at the time service was initiated based on the child/youth for whom the service authorization is entered.
 - For Core Services provided to children with a finalized adoption, program area was determined using the referral type of the assessment that led to the subsequent involvement.
- Children/youth receiving or benefitting from service was based on the following criteria:
 - Program Area 3 (prevention) - services provided in these involvements are typically connected to a parent but recorded on behalf of a child/youth in Trails. Because of this, the Trails service authorization may only be recorded for a single child/youth when in fact there may be several children/youth involved in

the case. To account for this data entry limitation, all children/youth who are active in the involvement at the time the service is initiated are counted as a child/youth benefitting from the service.

- Program Area 4 (youth in conflict) and Program Area 6 (adoption and emancipation) - services provided in these cases only count children/youth for whom the service authorization was entered since these services are directed toward a specific child/youth.
- Program Area 5 (child protection) - services provided in these cases are typically connected to a parent but recorded on behalf of a child/youth in Trails. Because of this, the Trails service authorization may only be recorded for a single child/youth when in fact there may be several children/youth involved in the case. To account for this data entry limitation, all children/youth who are active in the case at the time the service is initiated are counted as a child/youth benefitting from the service.
- Clients receiving services - To determine the actual clients receiving services, the individuals specified as 'Client Receiving Service(s)' in the Trails service authorization were used, as this multi-selection list allows both adults and children/youth to be selected.

Service Goal Adjustments

Trails changes went into effect in 2010 that allow for the permanency goal at time of service initiation to be tracked and stored for each Core Service authorization. Data entry lags in service goal information occasionally leads to inaccurate service goals on Core Service authorizations. To account for this, the following adjustments were made to the service goal specified for service authorizations:

- If the specified service goal was 'Remain Home,' but the child had an out-of-home (OOH) placement open at the time the service was open and that placement remained open for the first 30 days of the service, the goal was adjusted to 'Return Home.'
- If the specified service goal was 'Remain Home,' but the child has a removal within the first 30 days of the service, the goal was adjusted to 'Return Home.'
- If the specified service goal was 'Return Home,' but the child did not have an OOH placement within the first 30 days of the core service, the goal was adjusted to 'Remain Home.'
- No adjustments were made for the Least Restrictive Setting group, so the service goal indicated at time of service was used in the analyses.

Outcome Dataset Descriptions

The following datasets were used for the children and families served, services provided, service effectiveness, service goal attainment, and follow-up outcome analyses.

Clients Receiving Services Summary Dataset

This outcome dataset was used to determine the overall number of clients directly receiving services. This dataset used the clients specified in the Trails service authorization as 'Clients Receiving Services' and includes both adults and children.

- Used merged episodes (as defined above)
- Used service episodes open at any time during CY 2014

Children/Youth Receiving or Benefitting from Services Summary Dataset

This outcome dataset was used to determine the overall number of children either directly receiving or benefitting from services.

- Used merged episodes (as defined above)
- Children were identified as benefitting from or receiving a service as defined above
- Used service episodes open at any time during CY 2014

Services Received Dataset

This outcome dataset was used to determine the overall number and type of services received.

- Used merged service episodes (as defined above)
- Used services received at any point in time during CY 2014

Service Effectiveness Dataset

This outcome dataset was used to analyze how effective each service was at achieving the intended Core Service goal using the outcome codes entered at time of service closure. The unit of analysis is a per service episode (not per child/youth or per client).

- Used merged episodes (as defined above) closed in CY 2014
- The following service closure reasons were excluded because there is no service effectiveness outcome recorded in Trails:
 - Contract funds expended (only when system closed the service; include when caseworker selects)
 - Moved out of county
 - Case transferred to another county
 - Opened in error
 - Change in funding source
 - Payee wrong code

Service Goal Attainment Dataset

This outcome dataset was used to determine whether the service helped the child/youth achieve the overall service goal and is analyzed on a per-child/youth, per service basis.

- Children/youth were identified as benefitting from or receiving a service as defined above.
- Children/youth with involvements closed during CY 2014 with a service episode that ended less than four years before the involvement end date (four years allows for Termination of Parental Rights (TPR)/Adoption cases to close).
 - Children/youth receiving Core Services in adoption cases were pulled into this dataset at the time the adoption case closed (i.e., end of subsidy). This is a limitation of Trails because the 'services' case is merged into the adoption subsidy case rather than being a separate involvement episode.
- Service goal attainment (Yes or No) was calculated as follows:
 - Remain home - service goal was attained if child/youth did not have a removal from home during service episode or after service episode closed while the involvement remained open. This also was calculated based on if the child/youth had an open removal on the day the service ended to provide consistency with past Core Services evaluations.
 - Return home and/or placement with kin - service goal was attained if child/youth either returned home to parents or permanent Allocation of Parental Rights (APR)/guardianship was granted to relatives based on removal end reason and/or living arrangement.
 - Least Restrictive Setting - service goal was attained if: (1) permanency was achieved; (2) lower-level placement change occurred during or after the service episode; (3) same-level placement change occurred during or after the service episode; or (4) no change in placement during or after the service episode. Service goal will not be achieved if higher level placement change occurred during or after the service episode (based on the following hierarchy: DYC - Walkaway - Residential - Group Home - Foster Care - Independent Living - Kinship Care)
- Service episodes with a service close reason of 'Death' were excluded.
- Service episodes with a service close reason of 'Assessment Evaluation Only' were excluded unless for Special Economic Assistance or for one of the following service types: (1) Family Group Decision Making; (2) Mediation; (3) CET/TDM; or (4) Family Empowerment. The service authorizations closed with an 'Assessment Evaluation Only' reason (that are not family meetings) do not represent actual therapeutic interventions.

Follow-up Outcomes Dataset

This outcome dataset was used to compare one-year follow-up outcomes for children/youth who received or benefitted from Core Services and whose case was closed with the child living with their parents. This dataset is analyzed on a per-child/youth, per-service basis.

- Children/youth were identified as benefitting from or receiving a service as defined above.
- Cases closed during CY 2013 with child/youth living with parents as ending residence and with a service episode that ended less than two years before the case end date.
 - Children that did not have an ending residence of living with parents were not included in this dataset because, generally, they do not have an opportunity for follow-up events. These ending residence reasons include: Cases closed with (1) emancipation from OOH; (2) TPR/Adoption; (3) permanent custody/APR/Guardianship to kin; (4) youth committed to Division of Youth Corrections (DYC); (5) transfer to Developmental Disabilities Services; (6) moved out of State; (7) walkaway
- Service episodes with a child age 18 or older time of case closure were excluded.
- Service episodes with a service close reason of 'Assessment Evaluation Only' were excluded unless for Special Economic Assistance (SEA) or for one of the following service types outlined below. The service authorizations closed with an 'Assessment Evaluation Only' reason that are not family meetings do not represent actual therapeutic interventions.
 - Family Group Decision Making
 - Mediation
 - CET/TDM
 - Family Empowerment
- Follow-up outcomes include:
 - Subsequent referral/assessment/case/placement within one year
 - Subsequent DYC involvement (any)/DYC commitment within one year (for children ages 10 and older at time of closure)

Cost Datasets - General Considerations

All Core Services costs were pulled if the date of service fell within the calendar year regardless of date of payment. Pulling records based on date of payment rather than date of service will over-state costs as sometimes counties pay for several months of service in a single payment month (based on timing of bill submissions). As the report will be used for evaluation purposes and is not meant to be a financial accounting tool, pulling costs based on date of service is the most appropriate method of analyzing services provided in the calendar year.

Per-episode costs for county provided core services cannot be accurately obtained from Trails data because of the following limitations:

- County provided core service dollars are NOT evenly allocated across the Core Service types (e.g., a caseworker may spend 50% of time on home-based interventions and 50% of time on life skills). There is no designation in the available data systems (Trails or CFMS) for how each county designates its Core Services allocations into specific types of services.
- Not all service authorizations for county provided services are entered into Trails.

For counties that have shared Core Services contracts (fiscal agent counties in Trails), the expenditures were applied to the county that was responsible for the child (based on Trails service authorization), not the fiscal agent county. For guaranteed payments issued without any authorized children, the authorization county was set to the county that issued the payment.

Costs per Service Episode Dataset

This cost dataset was used to calculate the average cost per episode of service. As described above, per episode costs can only be obtained for purchased Core Services.

- Use expenditures for service episodes completed during CY 2014.

- This ensures that services authorized at or near the end of the year do not get counted as they have not had sufficient time to incur expenditures.
- Uses merged episodes (as defined above)
- Only paid Core Services were included (costs for no-pay services cannot be calculated).
- Special Economic Assistance was not included in the cost per service episode calculations because it is a one-time service with a capped expenditure limit (\$400 per family) unless a waiver to increase the limit was approved (up to a maximum of \$800 per family per year).
- Actual service closure reason was used to conduct separate analysis for therapeutic services and therapeutic assessments/evaluations.

Costs per Child/Youth and Costs per Client Dataset

This cost dataset was used to calculate the average cost per child/youth receiving or benefitting from a service and average cost per client receiving a service. This dataset provides summaries for both county provided and purchased Core Services. This dataset pulls actual expenditures for service episodes open at any time in CY 2014.

- Uses merged episodes (as defined above)
- Children/youth were identified as receiving or benefitting from a service as defined above.
- This analysis did not break cost per child/youth and cost per client data out by service type.
- The total of all children/youth that received or benefitted from a Core Service during CY 2014 was divided by the total expenditures.
- The total of all clients who received a Core Service during CY 2014 was divided by the total expenditures.

Cost Efficiency Dataset

This cost dataset was used to calculate overall cost efficiency of the Core Services program as measured by the estimated additional annual costs that would be incurred in the absence of core services. Because Core Services are provided to children/youth at “imminent” risk of removal or for children/youth who have already been removed from the home and placed into out-of-home care; the basis of the overall cost efficiency calculation is the assumption that, in the absence of Core Services, all children/youth would have been placed in out-of-home care. This methodology for the cost efficiency calculation is as follows:

1. Determine the number of 'involved days' for all children/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services during calendar year (service was open at some point in year). This number represents days in which a child/youth was involved in an open case in which Core Services were received.
2. For all children/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services, add all Core Services expenditures (including county provided) during year with all OOH placement expenditures incurred during year for these children/youth.
3. Divide total Core Services and OOH expenditures for children receiving or benefitting from Core Services from step 2 by total involved days from step 1 to get the average actual cost per child/youth per involved day. This takes into account children/youth that were able to entirely avoid OOH placements by using Core Services, children/youth who were reunified in a shorter time frame by using Core Services, as well as children/youth who entered the least restrictive setting as a result of Core Services. This also accounts for the expenditures for OOH days for children/youth that received Core Services and were not able to remain home.
4. Derive an average OOH cost per day by dividing all OOH expenditures (including “no-pay” kinship placements) during year by the total number of OOH days for all children/youth in the year - this is the overall average daily cost of placement.
5. Compare average daily OOH cost from step 4 to total average Core Services and OOH costs per child/youth per involved day to get an average cost difference per involved day.
6. Multiply total number of involved days (from step 1) by average cost difference per involved day (from step 5) to get overall cost efficiency.
7. Divide average cost difference per involved day by average actual cost per involved day to get cost efficiency ratio. This measure is based on the ratio between what was spent on Core Services and OOH placements and what would have been spent on OOH placement along, with higher ratios indicating greater cost efficiency.

Appendix B

Core Services County Designed Programs by County for CY 2014

The Core Services County Designed Programs **bolded** are Evidenced Based Services to Adolescents Awards \$4,006,949 State Wide - House Bill 14-1336 Family and Children's line, Footnote #34 (Long Bill)

County	Service Type on Core Plan	Existing Service Type in Trails to be Used
Adams	Supervised Therapeutic Visitation Service	Supervised Visitation
	Youth Intervention Program (Expansion - Ex)	Youth Intervention Program
	Youth Advocate Program	Child Mentoring/Family Support
	Family Team Meeting/Conference	Family Group Decision Making
	Mobile Intervention Team - Removal Protection Program	Family Empowerment
	Early Crisis Intervention (ECI)	Crisis Intervention
Alamosa	Discovery Group	Discovery Group
	Family Decision Making/Conference	Family Group Decision Making
	Intensive Mentoring Program (Ex)	Mentoring
	Nurturing Parenting	Nurturing Parenting
Arapahoe	Multi-Systemic Therapy (Ex) - Synergy	Multi Systemic Therapy
	Savio Direct Link Program (Ex)	Direct Link
	Family Group Conferencing	Family Group Decision Making
Archuleta	None	
Baca	None	
Bent	None	
Boulder	Community Evaluation Team (CET)	Community Evaluation Team
	Family Group Decision Making	Family Group Decision Making
	Foster Adoption Counseling and Support Services	Foster Care/Adoption Support
	Multi-Systemic Therapy (Ex)	Multi-Systemic Therapy
	Community Infant Therapy Services Program	Child and Family Therapist
Broomfield	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Multi-Systemic Therapy (Ex)	Multi Systemic Therapy
	Community Based and Family Support	Community Based and Family Support (CBFSS)
Chaffee	Chaffee County Mentoring (Ex)	Mentoring
	Youth at Crossroads	Youth Intervention Program
	Nurturing Parent Program	Nurturing Program
Cheyenne	None	
Clear Creek	None	
Conejos	Intensive Mentoring (Ex)	Mentoring
	Nurturing Parent Program	Nurturing Program
Costilla	Intensive Mentoring Project (Ex)	Mentoring
Crowley	None	
Custer	None	
Delta	Mentoring	Mentoring
	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Substance Abuse Intervention Team/Family Drug Ct	Family Empowerment
	Structured Parenting Time	Structured Parenting Time

County	Service Type on Core Plan	Existing Service Type in Trails to be Used
Denver	Functional Family Therapy	Functional Family Therapy
	Family Advocate Program	Supervised Visitation
	Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST) (Ex)	Multi Systemic Therapy
	Savio Direct Link Program	Direct Link
	Domestic Violence Intervention	Domestic Violence Services
	Team Decision Making	CET/TDM
	Stepping Out and Rebounding Program (SOAR)	Mentoring
	Mental Health System Navigator	Mental Health - County No Pay
	Substance Abuse Navigator	Substance Abuse - County No Pay
Dolores	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
Douglas	Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST)	Multi Systemic Therapy
	Functional Family Therapy	Functional Family Therapy
	Collaborative Family Services (CBFSS)	Community Based Family Services & Support (CBFSS)
	Domestic Violence Intervention	Domestic Violence Services
	Therapeutic Supervised Visitation	Supervised Visitation
	Fostering Healthy Futures	Foster Care/Adoption
Eagle	Family Centered Meeting Coordination (Ex)	Family Group Decision Making
	Mediation Services	Mediation Services
	Family Engagement Meetings	Family Engagement Meetings/Services
Elbert	Multi-Systemic Therapy (Ex)	Multi Systemic Therapy
	Family Coaching/Youth Mentoring (Ex)	Family Strengths
	Youth Mentoring	Mentoring
	Parenting With Love and Limits (Ex)	Parenting Skills
	Equine Therapy	Intensive Mentoring
El Paso	Mediation Services	Mediation
	Nurturing Programs	Nurturing Program
	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Supervised Visitation	Supervised Visitation
	Collaborative Family Services (CBFSS)	Community Based Family Services & Support (CBFSS)
	Domestic Violence	Domestic Violence Intervention Services
	Functional Family Therapy (Ex)	Functional Family Therapy
	Multi-Systemic Therapy (Ex)	Multi Systemic Therapy
	Reconnecting Youth/Vocational	Reconnecting Youth
	Team Decision Making	Team Decision Making (TDM)
Adolescent Mentoring	Mentoring	
Fremont	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Family Group Conferencing	Family Group Decision Making
	Adolescent Support Group	Adolescent Support Group
	Functional Family Therapy (Ex)	Functional Family Therapy
	Parenting with Love and Limits	Parenting Skills
	Supervised Visitation	Supervised Visitation
	Family Treatment Drug Court	Family Empowerment - High
	Fremont Fatherhood Program	Family Outreach
	EPP/Family Treatment Court	Family Empowerment/Treatment Package High
	Collaborative Family Services (CBFSS)	Community Based Family Services & Support (CBFSS)
	High Conflict Parenting Skills	Family Empowerment - Low

County	Service Type on Core Plan	Existing Service Type in Trails to be Used
Garfield	Adolescent Mediation (Ex)	Mediation
	Collaborative Family Services (CBFSS)	Community Based Family Services & Support (CBFSS)
Gilpin	None	
Grand	Parenting Time/Supervision	Supervised Visitation
	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Family to Family Team Decision Making	CET/TDM
Gunnison/Hinsdale	Therapeutic Mentoring (Ex)	Mentoring
Huerfano	Reconnecting Youth (Ex)	Reconnecting Youth
Jackson	Parent Focus Collaborative Family Services (CBFSS)	Community Based Family Services & Support (CBFSS)
	Child Mentoring/Family Support	Child Mentoring/Family Support
Jefferson	Multi-Systemic Therapy (Ex)	Multi Systemic Therapy
	Team Decision Making (Ex)	CET/TDM
	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Domestic Violence Consultation/Intervention	Domestic Violence Services
Kiowa	None	
Kit Carson	Functional Family Therapy (Ex)	Functional Family Therapy
Lake	High Fidelity Wraparound Program	Community Based Family Services & Support (CBFSS)
	Supervised Visitation	Supervised Visitation
La Plata	Play Therapy	Play Therapy
	Multi-Systemic Therapy (Ex)	Multi Systemic Therapy
	Ad. Dialectical Behavioral (Ex)	Youth Intervention Program
Larimer	Child Mentoring/Family Support	Child Mentoring/Family Support
	Multi-systemic Therapy	Multi Systemic Therapy
	Nat'l Youth Program Using Mini-Bikes (NYPUM) (Ex)	Reconnecting Youth
	PCC Mediation (Ex)	Mediation
	Family Options1	CET/TDM
	Family Options 2 - Family Unity Meetings	Family Empowerment
	Family Options 3 - Family Group Conferencing	Family Group Decision Making
	Life Nurse Visiting Program	Nurturing Program
	Community Based Family Services and Support	Community Based Family Services & Support (CBFSS)
	Functional Family Therapy (Ex)	Functional Family Therapy
Family Partnership	Mentoring	
Trauma Informed Behavioral Health	Behavioral Health	
Family Advocate Program	Family Outreach	
Las Animas	None	
Lincoln	Foster Adopt Parents Support Services	Foster Care/Adoption Support
Logan	Play Therapy	Play Therapy
	Parenting with Love and Limits	Parenting Skills
	Family Outreach Services	Family Outreach
Mesa	Structured/Supervised Parenting Time	Structured Parenting Time
	Rapid Response (Ex)	Youth Intervention Program
	Day Treatment to Adolescents (Ex)	Adolescent Support Group
	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Domestic Violence Intervention Services	Domestic Violence Intervention Services
	Child/Family Service Therapist	Child/Family Therapist

County	Service Type on Core Plan	Existing Service Type in Trails to be Used
Mesa (continued)	Community Based Family Services and Support	Community Based Family Services & Support (CBFSS)
	Mediation Program	Mediation
	Family Empowerment	Family Empowerment
	Peer Support Services	Mentoring
	Collaborative Child/Family Therapist	Child/Family Therapist
	Facilitated Permanency Meetings	Permanency Roundtables
Moffat	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Equine Therapy	Mentoring
Montezuma	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
Montrose	Promoting Healthy Adolescents Trends (Ex)	Adolescent Support Group
	Domestic Violence Intervention Services	Domestic Violence Intervention Services
Morgan	Structured Parenting Time	Structured Parenting Time
	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Family Group Decision Making	Family Group Decision Making
	Parenting With Love and Limits (Ex)	Parenting Skills
Otero	Play Therapy	Play Therapy
Ouray/ San Miguel	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Parenting with Love and Logic Way	Parenting Skills
Park	Family Engagement/Empowerment/ Preservation	Family Empowerment
Phillips	None	
Pitkin	Supervised Visitation	Supervised Visitation
Prowers	None	
Pueblo	Visitation Center	Supervised Visitation
	For Keeps Program (Ex)	Youth Outreach
Rio Blanco	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
Rio Grande/ Mineral	Nurturing Parenting Program	Nurturing Parenting
Routt	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Supervised Visitation Safe Exchange Program	Supervised Visitation
Saguache	Nurturing Parenting	Nurturing Parenting
San Juan	Multi-Systemic Therapy	Multi Systemic Therapy
Sedgwick	None	
Summit	Play Therapy	Play Therapy
	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Community Infant and Child Program	Family Empowerment
	Therapeutic Supervised Visitation	Supervised Visitation
Teller	Multi Systemic Therapy (Ex)	Multi Systemic Therapy
	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Collaborative Management Program Wrap Around/FGDM	Community Based Family Services & Support (CBFSS)
	Family Group Decision Making	Family Group Decision Making
	Permanency Roundtables	Permanency Roundtables
Washington	Play Therapy	Play Therapy
	Behavior Specialist	Child/Family Services Therapist
Weld	Functional Family Therapy (Ex)	Functional Family Therapy
	TIGHT (Ex)	Reconnecting Youth
	Multi-Systemic Therapy (Ex)	Multi Systemic Therapy
	Foster Parent Consultation	Foster care/Adoption Support

County	Service Type on Core Plan	Existing Service Type in Trails to be Used
Weld (continued)	Family Engagement Program	Family Empowerment
	Mobile Crisis Intervention and Stabilization Services	Crisis Intervention
	Family and Parent Mediation	Mediation
	Compass Program (CBFSS)	Community Based Family Services & Support (CBFSS)
	Role Model Mentoring	Child Mentoring/Family Support
	RMM Mentoring	Mentoring
Yuma	Mentoring to Adolescents	Mentoring
	Community Based Family Services	Community Based Family Services & Support (CBFSS)
Southern Ute	Multi-Systemic Therapy	Multi Systemic Therapy