



**COLORADO**

**Office of Children,  
Youth & Families**

Division of Child Welfare

# Core Services Program Annual Evaluation Report

January 1, 2015 - December 31, 2015



Colorado Department of Human Services  
Division of Child Welfare  
1575 Sherman Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Denver, CO 80203

P 303.866.5932  
[www.colorado.gov/cdhs/cw](http://www.colorado.gov/cdhs/cw)



**COLORADO**  
Department of Human Services

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

October 1, 2016

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Reggie Bicha".

Reggie Bicha  
Executive Director

Enclosures

Cc: Doug Friednash, Chief of Staff

# Core Services Program Annual Evaluation Report Calendar Year 2015

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](http://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 2015 .....	6
2.2. Services Provided in Calendar Year 2015 .....	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.....	29
4.2. Cost per Client .....	32
4.3. Cost per Child/Youth .....	34
4.4. Cost Efficiency .....	35
5. Family Preservation Commission Report Findings .....	37
5.1. Service Availability, Capacity, and Accessibility .....	37
5.2. Service Delivery .....	38
5.3. Service Collaboration.....	40
5.4. Service Funding .....	41
6. Conclusions and Implications .....	42
6.1. Evaluation Conclusions .....	42
6.2. Evaluation Strengths.....	43
6.3. Evaluation Limitations.....	43
6.4. Evaluation Implications .....	43
Appendix A - Core Services Program Evaluation Methods .....	45
Appendix B - Core Services County Designed Programs by County .....	50

# 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.

David Anderson  
Nicholas Barela  
Renee Beck  
Joni Bedell  
Sharon Blum  
Sara Boylan  
Claudia Budd  
Tonia Burnett  
Lori Carlson  
Matthew Caywood  
Matthew Dodson  
Betty Donovan  
Kim DuBois  
Linda Elliott  
Malynda Evans  
Josiah Forkner  
Carolyn Fox  
Soraya Frank  
Carol Friedrich  
Patricia Gibbons  
Dee Dee Green  
Jennifer Gribble  
Sherry Hansen  
Tim Hart  
David Henson  
Hollie Hillman  
Sheila Hudson-Macchietto  
Martha Johnson  
Kelly Keith  
Jody Kern

Karen Kinblade  
Kendra Kleinschmidt  
Sharon Longhurst-Pritt  
Mary Longmire  
Arlene Lopez  
Lori Lundgren  
Pamela McKay  
Germaine Meehan  
Lanie Meyers Mirelos  
John Mowery  
Dennis Pearson  
Patricia Phillips  
Kristin Pulatie  
Kathy Reano  
Erin Rinaldo  
Donna Rohde  
Dollie Rose  
Catherine Salazar  
Shannon Sheridan  
Taunia Shipman  
Michael Sidinger  
Tobi Vegter  
Jamie VieghausZak  
Tommy Vigil  
Ruth Wallace Porter  
Susan Walton  
Linda Warsh  
Catherine Weaver  
Barb Weinstein  
Gillian Wilks

## Special Thanks

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

Melinda Cox  
Katie Facchinello  
Karon Schleigh  
**Colorado Department of  
Human Services**

# Core Services Program Annual Evaluation Report Calendar Year 2015

## 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) 2015 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 2015.** In CY 2015, 26,435 distinct clients (unduplicated individuals) were served by the Core Services Program. This represents an increase of 2.6% in distinct clients served from CY 2014. 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. Overall, 15,887 distinct children/youth received or benefitted (services provided on behalf of a child/youth) from Core Services. This represents a 2.6% increase in distinct children/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services from CY 2014.

**Services Provided in CY 2015.** There were 30,033 service episodes (merged service authorizations within the same case for the same provider, service type, and clients) open at any time in CY 2015. This represents a 1.5% increase in service episodes from CY 2014. County designed services represent the most common type of service provided, with 33% 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 2014. 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 2015 were closed with a “successful” or “partially successful” service effectiveness outcome. This represents the same percentage of service episodes closed with a successful or partially successful outcome from CY 2014. Service episodes for children/youth with a remain home service goal or a prevention or Program Area Three (PA3) designation, as well as county provided services, had the highest rates of successful or partially successful service effectiveness.

**Service Goal Attainment.** The service goal was attained in 79% of all service episodes from CY 2015. The service goal attainment rate was 89% for remain home, 77% for least restrictive setting, and 69% for return home. Consistent with previous years’ findings, the remain home service goal attainment rate was 93% based on whether a child/youth had an open removal on the day the service ended.

The remain home service goal was attained in 100% of all PA3 service episodes.

**Follow-up Outcomes.** Based on a distinct count of 5,321 children/youth with closed cases in CY 2014, 45% of children/youth had a subsequent referral, 29% had a subsequent assessment, 5% had a subsequent founded assessment, 11% had a subsequent case, 5% had a subsequent placement, 11% had a subsequent DYC placement (detention or commitment), and 1% had a subsequent DYC commitment. The DYC outcomes were only measured for children/youth ages 10 and older at time of case closure. These follow-up outcomes are very similar to the outcomes for cases closed in 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 2015 was \$2,181 with

an average service duration of 133 days. For therapeutic assessments/evaluations, the average cost per service episode was \$565 with an average service duration of 39 days, which represents a decrease of 7.0% or \$42 in average cost per service episode from CY 2014. For therapeutic interventions, the average cost per service episode was \$2,454 with an average service duration of 149 days, which represents a decrease of 4.1% or \$106 in average cost per service episode from CY 2014.

**Cost per Client and Cost per Child/Youth.** The average cost per client statewide for CY 2015 was \$1,787 based on total expenditures of \$47,426,375 and 26,533 clients served. This represents an increase of 1.5% or \$26 in average cost per client from CY 2014. The average cost per child/youth statewide for CY 2015 was \$2,969 based on total expenditures of \$47,426,375 and 15,975 children/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services. This represents an increase of 1.5% or \$43 in average cost per child/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services from CY 2014.

**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 expenditures of \$112,272,993 and an estimated cost of \$157,918,317, an additional **\$45,645,325** would have been spent by county agencies statewide in CY 2015 if OOH placements had been provided exclusively instead of a combination of Core Services and OOH placements. This equates to an additional \$13 per child/youth per involved day that would have been spent statewide in CY 2015.

Over the past three calendar years, an additional \$166 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, 100% 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 2015 were determined to be successful or partially successful with 89% 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, 75% 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 79% of children/youth with an involvement closed in CY 2015. Similar to past evaluations, the remain home service goal was attained in 93% of service episodes when calculated based on if the child/youth had an open removal on the day the service ended. Life skills and mental health services had the highest remain home service goal attainment rates, while home-based interventions and sexual abuse treatment had the highest return home service goal attainment rate. Core Services coordinators reported that the rise in kinship care placements, increases in the frequency and timing of family meetings, a pronounced shift toward greater family engagement positively impacted service goal attainment outcomes.

**Core Services Impacts Subsequent Child Welfare Involvement.** For children/youth with a closed case in CY 2014, 45% of children/youth had a subsequent referral, 29% had a subsequent assessment, 5% had a subsequent founded assessment, 11% had a subsequent case, 5% had a subsequent placement, 11% had a subsequent DYC placement (detention or commitment), and 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.

**Core Services Provide Substantial Cost Efficiency for Colorado.** Without the Core Services Program, it is estimated that Colorado counties would have spent an additional \$46 million in CY 2015 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 implementation of front-loaded services, in-home mentoring and monitoring, after-care services, intensive community-based services, and county designed services have positively impacted the decrease in OOH placement rates and OOH lengths of stay.

## Implications

Core Services are especially effective for county provided services, prevention 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.

The positive findings for service effectiveness and service goal attainment indicate 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 in last year's report and continues in this year's report with the analysis of follow-up outcomes for children/youth who received PA3 services in CY 2014.

The cost evaluation results suggest that some counties are seeing greater cost efficiencies by reducing the amount of their fixed-rate contract expenditures. This is supported by some Core Services coordinators reporting that fee-for-service contracts appear to work better in managing expenditures. However, fixed-rate contracts appeal to coordinators from rural counties who use them as a means to maintain the sustainability of their providers due to the unpredictability of Core Services demand.

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 are being considered to more efficiently collect, enter, and access data regarding service delivery, costs, and outcomes. In addition, counties will be engaged through ongoing training and consultation opportunities to make full use of the available data for quality improvement purposes. Finally, counties have been 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 2015

### 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 Colorado DR 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 Colorado 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 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 Nurse Family Partnership 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 2015, 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 2015 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 2014 report 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 2015; and (3) longer-term 12-month child welfare involvement outcomes for children with a closed case in CY 2014. 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 2015.

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 12 months from January 2015 through December 2015 for the CY 2015 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.

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.<sup>1</sup> 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.

### 2.1. Children, Youth, and Families Served in CY 2015

The following definitions guided the analysis of children, youth, and families served during CY 2015.

**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.

---

<sup>1</sup> An estimation of the CY 2015 allocation would be \$53,351,678 based on averaging SFY 2016 (\$53,803,031) 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, **26,435 distinct clients (unduplicated individuals)** were served by the Core Services Program in CY 2015. This represents an increase of 2.6% in distinct clients served from CY 2014. 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 26,435 unduplicated individuals were served by the Core Services Program in CY 2015.

Table 1: Total Number of Distinct Clients Served by the Core Services Program in CY 2015

Distinct Count	Children/Youth		Adults		Total	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Clients	14,244	53.9	12,191	46.1	26,435	100.0

Table 2 shows that the largest groups served by the Core Services Program were White, non-Hispanic (48%) and Hispanic (31%). The average age of children served by Core Services was 8.5 years, while the average age of adults served by Core Services was 35.7 years.

Table 2: Race/Ethnicity of Distinct Clients Served by Core Services Program in CY 2015

Race/Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent
White, Non-Hispanic	12,573	47.6
Hispanic	8,123	30.7
Black or African American	1,931	7.3
Multiple Races	774	2.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	121	0.5
Asian	116	0.4
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	35	0.1
Did not Indicate	2,762	10.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>26,435</b>	<b>100.0</b>

As defined on page 6, **15,887 distinct children/youth from 9,155 cases/involvements** received or benefitted from Core Services in CY 2015. This represents a 2.6% increase in distinct children/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services from CY 2014. On the following page, Table 3 shows that 78% of all children/youth receiving or benefitting from services were designated as Program Area Five (PA5), 13% were designated as Program Area Four (PA4), 7% were designated as PA3, and 2% were designated as Program Area Six (PA6).

Table 3: Total Number of Children/Youth Receiving or Benefitting from Core Services Program by Program Area in CY 2015

Program Area	Frequency*	Percent
PA3 Services	1,161	7.2
PA4 Cases	2,129	13.3
PA5 Cases	12,441	77.5
PA6 Cases	318	2.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,049</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\*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.

There was an increase of 171% in children/youth receiving or benefitting from services with a PA3 designation from CY 2014. Of the 1,161 children/youth designated as PA3, 419 had a prior child welfare case (36%) with 76 designated as PA4 and 343 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.

## 2.2. Services Provided in CY 2015

As defined above, there were **30,033 service episodes** open at any time in CY 2015. This represents a 1.5% increase in service episodes from CY 2014. Table 4 shows that 77% of service episodes were associated with children with a PA5 designation while 17% were associated with PA4, 4% were associated with PA3, and 2% were associated with PA6. As for provider type, 67% of service episodes were purchased from external providers by counties while 33% were internally provided by counties. Almost three-quarters of all service episodes were for new services provided in CY 2015, while almost two-thirds of all service episodes closed in CY 2015.

Table 4: Characteristics of Service Episodes in CY 2015 (N = 30,033)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
<b>Program Area</b>		
PA3 Services	1,189	4.0
PA4 Cases	5,105	17.0
PA5 Cases	23,138	77.0
PA6 Cases	601	2.0
<b>Provider Type</b>		
Purchased	20,233	67.4
County provided	9,800	32.6
<b>Service Status</b>		
New Service in CY 2014	22,254	74.1
Closed Service in CY 2014	19,944	66.4

As displayed in Table 5, the most frequent Core Service type in CY15 was county designed services at 33%, followed by home-based interventions at 14%, and substance abuse treatment at 13%.

Table 5: Service Episodes in CY 2015 by Service Type

Service Type	Frequency	Percent
County Designed Services	9,879	32.9
Home-Based Interventions	4,075	13.6
Substance Abuse Treatment	3,950	13.2
Life Skills	3,133	10.4
Mental Health Services	3,105	10.3
Intensive Family Therapy	2,699	9.0
Special Economic Assistance	2,038	6.8
Sexual Abuse Treatment	855*	2.8
Day Treatment	299	1.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>30,033</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\*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 and home-based interventions. As displayed in Table 6, the most frequent substance types, for the 2,854 closed substance abuse treatment service episodes from CY 2015, were alcohol and methamphetamines at 24% and 22%, respectively, followed by marijuana at 20%.

Table 6: *Substance Types for Substance Abuse Treatment Service Episodes in CY 2015*

Substance Type	Frequency	Percent
Alcohol	693	24.3
Methamphetamines	618	21.7
Marijuana	576	20.2
Unknown/Other	462	16.2
Heroin	187	6.6
Other Opiates	159	5.6
Cocaine/Crack	139	4.9
Depressants	15	0.5
Stimulants	5	0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,854</b>	<b>100.0</b>

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, and family empowerment. These five service types comprise 55% of all county designed service episodes in CY 2015.

Table 7: *Service Episodes by County Designed Service Type for CY 2015*

Service Type	Frequency	Percent
Family Group Decision Making	2,148	21.7
Supervised Visitation	1,631	16.5
Child Mentoring and Family Support	600	6.1
Family Empowerment	566	5.7
CET / TDM	535	5.4
Mentoring	418	4.2
Structured Parenting Time	378	3.8
Multi Systemic Therapy	362	3.7
Domestic Violence Intervention Services	360	3.6
Community Based Family Support Services	320	3.2
Trauma Informed Care/Services	313	3.2
Family Outreach	297	3.0
Mediation	279	2.8
Day Treatment Alternative	220	2.2
Child/Family Service Therapist	211	2.1
Life Skills Apprenticeship	201	2.0
Nurturing Program	169	1.7
Youth Intervention Program	147	1.5
Direct Link	117	1.2
Mobile Intervention Team	113	1.1
Parenting Skills	94	1.0
Reconnecting Youth	84	0.9
Functional Family Therapy	77	0.8

Table 7 (continued)

Service Type	Frequency	Percent
Behavioral Health	69	0.7
Play Therapy	54	0.5
Youth Outreach	31	0.3
Family Strengths	23	0.2
Foster Care/Adoption Support	22	0.2
Adolescent Support Group	17	0.2
Adoption Counseling	12	0.1
Other	11	0.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,879</b>	<b>100.0</b>

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 2015 by county.

Table 8: *Count of Clients Served, Children/Youth Receiving or Benefitting from Core Services, and Service Episodes for CY 2015 by County*

County	Clients Served*	Percent of State Total	Children/Youth Receiving/Benefitting*	Percent of State Total	Service Episodes	Percent of State Total
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>26,533</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>15,975</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>30,033</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Adams	2,373	8.9	1,550	9.7	2,837	9.4
Alamosa	270	1.0	201	1.3	311	1.0
Arapahoe	2,707	10.2	1,610	10.1	2,180	7.3
Archuleta	117	.4	64	.4	102	0.3
Baca	8	.0	7	.0	25	0.1
Bent	48	.2	27	.2	49	0.2
Boulder	936	3.5	462	2.9	823	2.7
Broomfield	119	.4	111	.7	189	0.6
Chaffee	60	.2	45	.3	58	0.2
Cheyenne	19	.1	8	.1	8	0.0
Clear Creek	43	.2	25	.2	29	0.1
Conejos	116	.4	94	.6	100	0.3
Costilla	94	.4	77	.5	107	0.4
Crowley	18	.1	20	.1	24	0.1
Custer	10	.0	5	.0	6	0.0
Delta	165	.6	107	.7	150	0.5
Denver	2,457	9.3	1,733	10.8	2,577	8.6
Dolores	2	.0	5	.0	12	0.0
Douglas	550	2.1	285	1.8	462	1.5
Eagle	127	.5	67	.4	119	0.4
El Paso	4,129	15.6	2,135	13.4	5,717	19.0
Elbert	109	.4	67	.4	77	0.3
Fremont	483	1.8	293	1.8	624	2.1
Garfield	165	.6	119	.7	167	0.6
Gilpin	42	.2	17	.1	24	0.1
Grand	64	.2	46	.3	60	0.2
Gunnison/ Hinsdale	83	.3	48	.3	70	0.2
Huerfano	37	.1	31	.2	37	0.1
Jackson	3	.0	4	.0	3	0.0
Jefferson	1,974	7.4	1,395	8.7	2,774	9.2
Kiowa	18	.1	10	.1	10	0.0
Kit Carson	56	.2	25	.2	44	0.1
La Plata/ San Juan	355	1.3	214	1.3	559	1.9

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	23	.1	67	0.2
Larimer	2,828	10.7	1,443	9.0	3,406	11.3
Las Animas	116	.4	78	.5	95	0.3
Lincoln	75	.3	46	.3	75	0.2
Logan	222	.8	114	.7	205	0.7
Mesa	913	3.4	614	3.8	1,313	4.4
Moffat	121	.5	65	.4	125	0.4
Montezuma	51	.2	56	.4	113	0.4
Montrose	359	1.4	192	1.2	180	0.6
Morgan	304	1.1	171	1.1	329	1.1
Otero	121	.5	112	.7	83	0.3
Ouray/ San Miguel	27	.1	24	.2	72	0.2
Park	74	.3	32	.2	61	0.2
Phillips	14	.1	12	.1	17	0.1
Pitkin	40	.2	27	.2	56	0.2
Prowers	124	.5	71	.4	151	0.5
Pueblo	1,143	4.3	697	4.4	1,621	5.4
Rio Blanco	78	.3	38	.2	34	0.1
Rio Grande/ Mineral	88	.3	49	.3	75	0.2
Routt	49	.2	41	.3	45	0.1
Saguache	45	.2	22	.1	24	0.1
Sedgwick	1	.0	2	.0	2	0.0
Summit	78	.3	38	.2	89	0.3
Teller	207	.8	102	.6	182	0.6
Washington	45	.2	27	.2	27	0.1
Weld	1,361	5.1	816	5.1	1,072	3.6
Yuma	249	.9	156	1.0	180	0.6

\*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 2015 calendar year, 19,944 total service episodes were closed in Trails. The final service effectiveness sample size was 12,426 closed 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 2015 across all service types, service goals, and program areas. Approximately 80% of service episodes in CY 2015 were closed with a “successful” (61%) or “partially successful” (18%) outcome designation while 12% were closed with a “not successful, did not engage” outcome and 9% were closed with a “not successful, no progress” outcome. This represents the same percentage of service episodes closed with a successful or partially successful outcome as in CY 2014.

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 2015*

Service Outcome	Frequency	Percent
Successful	7,630	61.4
Partially Successful	2,249	18.1
Not Successful, Did Not Engage	1,450	11.7
Not Successful, No Progress	1,097	8.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,426</b>	<b>100.0</b>

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".

As displayed in Table 10, 85% of service episodes for children/youth with a remain home service goal at time of service initiation were closed with a "successful" or "partially successful" outcome designation, followed by service episodes with a least restrictive setting service goal at 80%, and service episodes with a return home service goal at 73%.

Table 10: Service Effectiveness Outcomes by Service Goal for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2015 (N = 12,426)

Service Goal	Successful/Partially Successful		Not Successful	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Least Restrictive Setting	179	79.6	46	20.4
Remain Home	5,371	85.4	919	14.6
Return Home	4,329	73.2	1,582	26.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,879</b>	<b>79.5</b>	<b>2,547</b>	<b>20.5</b>

As displayed in Table 11, 82% of county provided service episodes were closed with a "successful" or "partially successful" outcome designation, while 78% of purchased service episodes were closed with a "successful" or "partially successful" outcome designation.

Table 11: Service Effectiveness Outcomes by Provider Type for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2015 (N = 12,426)

Provider Type	Successful/Partially Successful		Not Successful	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Purchased	6,765	78.3	1,872	21.7
County Provided	3,114	82.2	675	17.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,879</b>	<b>79.5</b>	<b>2,547</b>	<b>20.5</b>

As displayed in Table 12, 88% of service episodes for children/youth with a PA3 or PA6 designation at time of service initiation were closed with a "successful" or "partially successful" outcome designation, followed by service episodes for children/youth with a PA5 designation at 79%, and service episodes for children/youth with a PA4 designation at 78%.

Table 12: Service Effectiveness Outcomes by Program Area for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2015 (N = 12,426)

Program Area	Successful/Partially Successful		Not Successful	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
PA3 Services	488	88.6	63	11.4
PA4 Cases	1,902	78.4	523	21.6
PA5 Cases	7,299	79.0	1,936	21.0
PA6 Cases	190	88.4	25	11.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,879</b>	<b>79.5</b>	<b>2,547</b>	<b>20.5</b>

On the following page, Table 13 shows that 91% of service episodes for children/youth who had an open case within 60 days prior to receiving PA3 services were closed with a "successful" or "partially successful" outcome designation; 90% of service episodes for children/youth who had a screen-out referral within 60 days prior to receiving PA3 services were closed with a "successful" or "partially successful" outcome designation; and 81% of service episodes for children/youth who had a closed assessment within 60 days prior to receiving PA3 services were closed with a "successful" or "partially successful" outcome designation.

Table 13: Service Effectiveness Outcomes by Program Area 3 Type for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2015 (N = 551)

PA3 Type	Successful/Partially Successful		Not Successful	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Intervention	148	91.4	14	8.6
Prevention - Closed Assessment	91	80.6	22	19.4
Prevention - Screen-out	249	90.2	27	9.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>488</b>	<b>88.6</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>11.4</b>

Table 14 shows that sexual abuse treatment (87%) and home-based interventions (82%) had the highest percentage of episodes closed in CY 2015 with either a “successful” or “partially successful” designation. Substance abuse treatment (69%) and day treatment (75%) and had the lowest rates of “successful” or “partially successful” outcome designations in CY 2015.

Table 14: Service Effectiveness Outcomes by Service Type for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2015 (N = 12,426)

Service Type	Successful/Partially Successful		Not Successful	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Sexual Abuse Treatment	249	86.8	38	13.2
Home-Based Interventions	1,498	82.3	322	17.7
Intensive Family Therapy	1,110	81.4	254	18.6
County Designed Services	3,608	81.3	831	18.7
Life Skills	1,229	80.2	303	19.8
Mental Health Services	919	80.1	229	19.9
Day Treatment	111	74.5	38	25.5
Substance Abuse Treatment	1,155	68.5	532	31.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,879</b>	<b>79.5</b>	<b>2,547</b>	<b>20.5</b>

Table 15 shows the service effectiveness outcomes for service episodes closed in CY 2015 by county.

Table 15: Service Effectiveness Outcomes by County for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2015 (N = 12,426)

County	Successful/Partially Successful		Not Successful	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>9,879</b>	<b>79.5</b>	<b>2,547</b>	<b>20.5</b>
Adams	696	72.2	268	27.8
Alamosa	103	79.8	26	20.2
Arapahoe	881	82.2	191	17.8
Archuleta	33	76.7	10	23.3
Baca	9	81.8	2	18.2
Bent	34	91.9	3	8.1
Boulder	160	76.9	48	23.1
Broomfield	80	87.0	12	13.0
Chaffee	7	100.0	0	0.0
Cheyenne	4	100.0	0	0.0
Clear Creek	5	71.4	2	28.6
Conejos	33	73.3	12	26.7
Costilla	33	97.1	1	2.9
Crowley	5	100.0	0	0.0
Custer	1	100.0	0	0.0
Delta	50	65.8	26	34.2
Denver	661	71.3	266	28.7
Dolores	2	100.0	0	0.0
Douglas	153	78.5	42	21.5
Eagle	40	90.9	4	9.1
El Paso	1,749	87.3	255	12.7
Elbert	18	94.7	1	5.3
Fremont	291	80.6	70	19.4
Garfield	36	72.0	14	28.0

Table 15 (continued)

County	Successful/Partially Successful		Not Successful	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Gilpin	7	100.0	0	0.0
Grand	31	81.6	7	18.4
Gunnison/Hinsdale	25	100.0	0	0.0
Huerfano	0	0.0	1	100.0
Jackson	1	50.0	1	50.0
Jefferson	884	75.4	289	24.6
Kiowa	4	80.0	1	20.0
Kit Carson	16	66.7	8	33.3
La Plata/San Juan	227	87.3	33	12.7
Lake	6	30.0	14	70.0
Larimer	1,788	87.8	249	12.2
Las Animas	16	50.0	16	50.0
Lincoln	15	88.2	2	11.8
Logan	60	83.3	12	16.7
Mesa	399	65.5	210	34.5
Moffat	44	68.8	20	31.2
Montezuma	28	90.3	3	9.7
Montrose	37	82.2	8	17.8
Morgan	123	79.9	31	20.1
Otero	26	65.0	14	35.0
Ouray/San Miguel	21	100.0	0	0.0
Park	14	58.3	10	41.7
Phillips	3	75.0	1	25.0
Pitkin	18	94.7	1	5.3
Prowers	52	82.5	11	17.5
Pueblo	436	63.8	247	36.2
Rio Blanco	12	92.3	1	7.7
Rio Grande/Mineral	9	50.0	9	50.0
Routt	10	76.9	3	23.1
Saguache	12	100.0	0	0.0
Sedgwick	0	0.0	1	100.0
Summit	9	81.8	2	18.2
Teller	51	91.1	5	8.9
Washington	7	53.8	6	46.2
Weld	335	83.5	66	16.5
Yuma	69	85.2	12	14.8

### 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 8,213 unduplicated children/youth with a closed case (or closed involvement for PA3) in CY 2015. There were 34,005 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 2015 but were provided during closed involvement spans in CY 2015.

### 3.2.1. Overall Service Goal Attainment Results

Table 16 shows the proportion of service episodes within closed involvement spans in CY 2015 by service goal type with 51% having a goal of return home, 48% having a goal of remain home, and 1% having a goal of the least restrictive setting.

Table 16: Service Goal Frequencies for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2015

Service Goal	Frequency	Percent
Return Home	17,353	51.0
Remain Home	16,302	47.9
Less Restrictive	350	1.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>34,005</b>	<b>100.0</b>

As displayed in Table 17, the service type with the highest percentage of return home service goals was substance abuse treatment at 60%, the service type with the highest percentage of remain home service goals was day treatment at 55%, and the service type with the highest percentage of least restrictive setting service goals was day treatment at 10%.

Table 17: Service Type Frequencies by Service Goal for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2015 (N = 34,005)

Service Type	Return Home		Remain Home		Least Restrictive Setting	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
County Designed Services	4,989	47.0	5,539	52.2	77	0.7
Day Treatment	92	35.8	140	54.5	25	9.7
Home-Based Interventions	2,145	47.2	2,344	51.6	53	1.2
Intensive Family Therapy	1,496	49.2	1,517	49.9	26	0.9
Life Skills	1,866	57.7	1,326	41.0	40	1.2
Mental Health Services	1,908	58.3	1,311	40.0	55	1.7
Sexual Abuse Treatment	306	42.9	380	53.3	27	3.8
Special Economic Assistance	1,816	47.6	1,966	51.5	35	0.9
Substance Abuse Treatment	2,735	60.4	1,779	39.3	12	0.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>17,353</b>	<b>51.0</b>	<b>16,302</b>	<b>47.9</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>1.0</b>

On the following page, Table 18 shows that the service goal was attained in 79% of all service episodes in CY 2015. The service goal attainment rate was 89% for remain home, 77% for least restrictive setting, and 69% 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 93% 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 2015 attained their service goal.

Table 18: *Service Goal Attainment by Service Goal Type for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2015 (N = 34,005)*

Service Goal	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Remain Home	14,456	88.7	1,846	11.3
Return Home	12,021	69.3	5,332	30.7
Least Restrictive Setting	269	76.9	81	23.1
<b>Overall</b>	<b>26,746</b>	<b>78.7</b>	<b>7,259</b>	<b>21.3</b>

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.

### 3.2.2. Remain Home Service Goal Attainment Results

As displayed in Table 19, county provided service episodes had a 91% remain home service goal attainment rate, while purchased service episodes had an 87% remain home service goal attainment rate.

The remain home service goal was attained in 100% of all PA3 service episodes.

Table 19: *Remain Home Service Goal Attainment by Provider Type for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2015 (N = 16,302)*

Provider Type	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
County Provided	5,403	90.9	543	9.1
Purchased	9,053	87.4	1,303	12.6
<b>Overall</b>	<b>14,456</b>	<b>88.7</b>	<b>1,846</b>	<b>11.3</b>

As displayed in Table 20, service episodes for children/youth with a PA3 designation had a 100% remain home service goal attainment rate; service episodes for children/youth with a PA5 designation had a 91% remain home service goal attainment rate; service episodes for children/youth with a PA4 designation had a 73% remain home service goal attainment rate; and service episodes for children/youth with a PA6 designation had a 56% remain home 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 20: *Remain Home Service Goal Attainment by Program Area for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2015 (N = 16,302)*

Program Area	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
PA3 Services	808	99.9	1	0.1
PA4 Cases	1,608	73.2	589	26.8
PA5 Cases	12,015	90.7	1,236	9.3
PA6 Cases	25	55.6	20	44.4
<b>Overall</b>	<b>14,456</b>	<b>88.7</b>	<b>1,846</b>	<b>11.3</b>

On the following page, Table 21 shows that service episodes for children/youth who had an open case within 60 days prior to receiving PA3 services had a 100% remain home service goal attainment rate; service episodes for children/youth who had a closed assessment within 60 days prior to receiving PA3 services had a 100% remain home service goal attainment rate; and service episodes for children/youth who had a screened-out referral within 60 days prior to receiving PA3 services had a 100% remain home service goal attainment rate.

Table 21: *Remain Home Service Goal Attainment Outcomes by PA3 Type for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2015 (N = 809)*

PA3 Type	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Intervention	179	100.0	0	0.0
Prevention - Closed Assessment	158	100.0	0	0.0
Prevention - Screen-out	471	99.8	1	0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>808</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.1</b>

Table 22 shows that service episodes for life skills (92%) and mental health services (92%) had the highest remain home service goal attainment rates, while day treatment (67%) had the lowest remain home service goal attainment rate.

Table 22: *Remain Home Service Goal Attainment by Service Type for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2015 (N = 16,302)*

Service Type	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Life Skills	1,219	91.9	107	8.1
Mental Health Services	1,199	91.5	112	8.5
Sexual Abuse Treatment	344	90.5	36	9.5
Special Economic Assistance	1,774	90.2	192	9.8
County Designed Services	4,965	89.6	574	10.4
Intensive Family Therapy	1,331	87.7	186	12.3
Substance Abuse Treatment	1,530	86.0	249	14.0
Home-Based Interventions	2,000	85.3	344	14.7
Day Treatment	94	67.1	46	32.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,456</b>	<b>88.7</b>	<b>1,846</b>	<b>11.3</b>

Table 23 shows the service goal attainment rates for services episodes with a remain home goal by county.

Table 23: *Remain Home Service Goal Attainment by County for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2015 (N = 16,302)*

County*	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>14,456</b>	<b>88.7</b>	<b>1,846</b>	<b>11.3</b>
Adams	2,013	85.9	330	14.1
Alamosa	128	96.2	5	3.8
Arapahoe	1,014	88.1	137	11.9
Archuleta	57	100.0	0	0.0
Baca	21	100.0	0	0.0
Bent	56	100.0	0	0.0
Boulder	439	92.0	38	8.0
Broomfield	129	93.5	9	6.5
Chaffee	16	100.0	0	0.0
Cheyenne	6	100.0	0	0.0
Clear Creek	9	100.0	0	0.0
Conejos	101	92.7	8	7.3
Costilla	46	100.0	0	0.0
Crowley	0	0.0	2	100.0
Delta	47	97.9	1	2.1
Denver	1,008	88.6	130	11.4
Dolores	5	100.0	0	0.0
Douglas	221	81.2	51	18.8
Eagle	94	90.4	10	9.6
El Paso	3,059	84.5	563	15.5

Table 23 (continued)

County*	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Elbert	23	85.2	4	14.8
Fremont	259	79.2	68	20.8
Garfield	139	94.6	8	5.4
Gilpin	4	66.7	2	33.3
Grand	36	100.0	0	0.0
Gunnison/Hinsdale	40	95.2	2	4.8
Huerfano	14	100.0	0	0.0
Jackson	2	100.0	0	0.0
Jefferson	741	87.1	110	12.9
Kiowa	2	100.0	0	0.0
Kit Carson	40	100.0	0	0.0
La Plata/San Juan	385	98.2	7	1.8
Lake	15	100.0	0	0.0
Larimer	2,080	93.7	141	6.3
Las Animas	31	93.9	2	6.1
Lincoln	26	70.3	11	29.7
Logan	62	95.4	3	4.6
Mesa	210	81.7	47	18.3
Moffat	98	97.0	3	3.0
Montezuma	42	91.3	4	8.7
Montrose	59	77.6	17	22.4
Morgan	118	93.7	8	6.3
Otero	41	95.3	2	4.7
Ouray/San Miguel	20	95.2	1	4.8
Park	37	100.0	0	0.0
Phillips	1	100.0	0	0.0
Pitkin	31	88.6	4	11.4
Prowers	98	90.7	10	9.3
Pueblo	574	87.0	86	13.0
Rio Blanco	26	100.0	0	0.0
Rio Grande/Mineral	28	93.3	2	6.7
Routt	18	94.7	1	5.3
Saguache	21	87.5	3	12.5
Sedgwick	3	100.0	0	0.0
Summit	68	95.8	3	4.2
Teller	93	100.0	0	0.0
Washington	26	92.9	2	7.1
Weld	363	97.3	10	2.7
Yuma	113	99.1	1	0.9

\* Custer County had no eligible service episodes for this analysis.

### 3.2.3. Return Home Service Goal Attainment Results

As displayed in Table 24, county provided service episodes had a 72% return home service goal attainment rate, while purchased service episodes had a 68% return home service goal attainment rate.

Table 24: Return Home Service Goal Attainment by Provider Type for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2015 (N = 17,353)

Provider Type	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
County Provided	4,119	71.8	1,621	28.2
Purchased	7,902	68.0	3,711	32.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>12,021</b>	<b>69.3</b>	<b>5,332</b>	<b>30.7</b>

As displayed in Table 25, service episodes for children/youth with a PA5 designation had a 70% return home service goal attainment rate; service episodes for children/youth with a PA4 designation had a 60% return home service goal attainment rate; and service episodes for children/youth with a PA6 designation had a 31% return home service goal attainment rate.

Table 25: Return Home Service Goal Attainment by Program Area for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2015 (N = 17,353)

Program Area	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
PA4 Cases	691	59.6	469	40.4
PA5 Cases	11,288	70.3	4,769	29.7
PA6 Cases	42	30.9	94	69.1
<b>Overall</b>	<b>12,021</b>	<b>69.3</b>	<b>5,332</b>	<b>30.7</b>

Table 26 shows that service episodes for home-based interventions (74%), sexual abuse treatment (73%), and county designed services (73%) had the highest return home service goal attainment rates, while day treatment (49%) and mental health services (58%) had the lowest return home service goal attainment rates.

Table 26: Return Home Service Goal Attainment by Service Type for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2015 (N = 17,353)

Service Type	Attained		Not Attained	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Home-Based Interventions	1,576	73.5	569	26.5
Sexual Abuse Treatment	223	72.9	83	27.1
County Designed Services	3,622	72.6	1,367	27.4
Intensive Family Therapy	1,058	70.7	438	29.3
Life Skills	1,316	70.5	550	29.5
Special Economic Assistance	1,281	70.5	535	29.5
Substance Abuse Treatment	1,792	65.5	943	34.5
Mental Health Services	1,108	58.1	800	41.9
Day Treatment	45	48.9	47	51.1
<b>Overall</b>	<b>12,021</b>	<b>69.3</b>	<b>5,332</b>	<b>30.7</b>

Table 27 shows the service goal attainment rates for services episodes with a return home goal by county.

Table 27: Return Home Service Goal Attainment by County for Service Episodes from Involvements Closed in CY 2015 (N = 17,353)

County*	Attained		Not Attained	
	Count	%	Count	%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>12,021</b>	<b>69.3</b>	<b>5,332</b>	<b>30.7</b>
Adams	1,413	68.3	655	31.7
Alamosa	128	81.5	29	18.5
Arapahoe	855	75.3	280	24.7
Archuleta	5	23.8	16	76.2
Baca	4	100.0	0	0.0
Bent	26	63.4	15	36.6
Boulder	204	64.6	112	35.4
Broomfield	43	81.1	10	18.9
Chaffee	12	100.0	0	0.0
Cheyenne	4	100.0	0	0.0
Clear Creek	2	25.0	6	75.0
Conejos	52	100.0	0	0.0
Costilla	6	66.7	3	33.3
Crowley	17	100.0	0	0.0
Custer	1	100.0	0	0.0

Table 27 (continued)

County*	Attained		Not Attained	
	Count	%	Count	%
Delta	83	51.9	77	48.1
Denver	1,251	65.0	675	35.0
Douglas	187	65.8	97	34.2
Eagle	15	68.2	7	31.8
El Paso	2,928	71.5	1,166	28.5
Elbert	15	68.2	7	31.8
Fremont	379	62.4	228	37.6
Garfield	32	25.2	95	74.8
Gilpin	3	75.0	1	25.0
Grand	0	0.0	24	100.0
Gunnison/Hinsdale	12	100.0	0	0.0
Huerfano	0	0.0	1	100.0
Jefferson	1,120	71.3	450	28.7
Kiowa	2	100.0	0	0.0
Kit Carson	23	100.0	0	0.0
La Plata/San Juan	20	74.1	7	25.9
Lake	12	54.5	10	45.5
Larimer	908	81.3	209	18.7
Las Animas	41	49.4	42	50.6
Lincoln	17	100.0	0	0.0
Logan	56	76.7	17	23.3
Mesa	615	59.8	413	40.2
Moffat	63	63.6	36	36.4
Montezuma	22	78.6	6	21.4
Montrose	51	91.1	5	8.9
Morgan	89	58.9	62	41.1
Otero	53	54.1	45	45.9
Park	0	0.0	24	100.0
Pitkin	7	43.8	9	56.2
Prowers	24	85.7	4	14.3
Pueblo	813	80.3	199	19.7
Rio Blanco	5	62.5	3	37.5
Rio Grande/Mineral	28	48.3	30	51.7
Routt	7	100.0	0	0.0
Saguache	4	33.3	8	66.7
Summit	0	0.0	3	100.0
Teller	29	80.6	7	19.4
Washington	17	94.4	1	5.6
Weld	303	56.0	238	44.0
Yuma	15	100.0	0	0.0

\* Dolores, Jackson, Ouray/San Miguel, Phillips, and Sedgwick 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 2014 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.

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

Table 28 shows the overall follow-up outcomes for a distinct count of 5,321 children/youth with closed cases in CY 2014. Overall, 45% of children/youth had a subsequent referral, 29% had a subsequent assessment, 5% had a subsequent founded assessment, 11% had a subsequent case, 5% had a subsequent placement, 11% had a subsequent DYC placement (detention or commitment), and 1% had a subsequent DYC commitment. These follow-up outcomes are very similar to the outcomes for cases closed in CY 2013.

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

Table 28: Frequency of Follow-up Events for Distinct Children/Youth from Closed Cases in CY 2014

Outcome	Frequency	Percent
<b>Subsequent Referral (N = 5,321)</b>		
Yes	2,380	44.7
No	2,941	55.3
<b>Subsequent Assessment (N = 5,321)</b>		
Yes	1,536	28.9
No	3,785	71.1
<b>Subsequent Founded Assessment (N = 5,321)</b>		
Yes	279	5.2
No	5,042	94.8
<b>Subsequent Case (N = 5,321)</b>		
Yes	566	10.6
No	4,755	89.4
<b>Subsequent Placement (N = 5,321)</b>		
Yes	247	4.6
No	5,074	95.4
<b>Subsequent DYC Placement (N = 2,235)*</b>		
Yes	252	11.3
No	1,983	88.7
<b>Subsequent DYC Commitment (N = 2,235)*</b>		
Yes	25	1.1
No	2,210	98.9

\*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

On the following page, Table 29 shows the proportion of service episodes within involvement spans for children/youth with closed cases in CY 2014 by service goal type. Of the 20,018 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 29: Service Goal Frequencies for Service Episodes from Cases Closed in CY 2014 (N = 20,018)

Service Goal	Frequency	Percent
Remain Home	13,225	66.1
Return Home	6,776	33.8
Least Restrictive Setting	17	0.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,018</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 30 shows the findings based on a service episode analysis for follow-up outcomes by service goal group.

- Children/youth with a remain home service goal had a 45.4% subsequent referral rate, while children/youth with a return home service goal had a 47.8% subsequent referral rate.
- Children/youth with a remain home service goal had a 30.4% subsequent assessment rate, while children/youth with a return home service goal had a 30.0% subsequent assessment rate.
- Children/youth with a remain home service goal had a 4.9% subsequent founded assessment rate, while children/youth with a return home service goal had a 7.3% subsequent founded assessment rate.
- Children/youth with a remain home service goal had a 9.4% subsequent case rate, while children/youth with a return home service goal had a 10.4% subsequent case rate.
- Children/youth with a remain home service goal had a 4.0% subsequent placement rate, while children/youth with a return home service goal had a 7.2% subsequent placement rate.
- Children/youth with a remain home service goal had a 9.7% subsequent DYC placement rate, while children/youth with a return home service goal had an 8.4% subsequent DYC placement rate.
- Children/youth with a remain home service goal had a 0.6% subsequent DYC commitment rate, while children/youth with a return home service goal had a 1.0% subsequent DYC commitment rate.

Table 30: Frequency of Follow-up Events by Service Goal Group for Service Episodes from Closed Cases in CY 2014

Outcome	Frequency	Percent
<b>Subsequent Referral</b>		
Remain Home (N = 13,225)	6,003	45.4
Return Home (N = 6,776)	3,238	47.8
<b>Subsequent Assessment</b>		
Remain Home (N = 13,225)	4,016	30.4
Return Home (N = 6,776)	2,035	30.0
<b>Subsequent Founded Assessment</b>		
Remain Home (N = 13,225)	653	4.9
Return Home (N = 6,776)	494	7.3
<b>Subsequent Case</b>		
Remain Home (N = 13,225)	1,248	9.4
Return Home (N = 6,776)	708	10.4
<b>Subsequent Placement</b>		
Remain Home (N = 13,225)	526	4.0
Return Home (N = 6,776)	486	7.2
<b>Subsequent DYC Placement*</b>		
Remain Home (N = 5,453)	527	9.7
Return Home (N = 2,205)	185	8.4
<b>Subsequent DYC Commitment*</b>		
Remain Home (N = 5,453)	35	0.6
Return Home (N = 2,205)	21	1.0

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

As displayed in Table 31, the follow-up outcomes by program area are based on service episodes from all cases closed in CY 2014. Service episodes for children/youth with a PA6 designation were not included in the analysis because of the low sample size ( $n = 17$ ).

Service episodes for children with a PA3 designation had a 24% subsequent referral rate, a 14% subsequent assessment rate, a 2% subsequent founded assessment rate, a 6% subsequent case rate, a 0% subsequent placement rate, a 3% subsequent DYC placement (any DYC) rate, and a 1% subsequent DYC commitment rate.

Service episodes for children with a PA4 designation had a 46% subsequent referral rate, a 33% subsequent assessment rate, a 1% subsequent founded assessment rate, a 21% subsequent case rate, a 9% subsequent placement rate, a 29% subsequent DYC placement (any DYC) rate, and a 3% subsequent DYC commitment rate.

Service episodes for children with a PA5 designation had a 46% subsequent referral rate, a 30% subsequent assessment rate, a 6% subsequent founded assessment rate, a 9% subsequent case rate, a 5% subsequent placement rate, a 4% subsequent DYC placement (any DYC) rate, and a 0% subsequent DYC commitment rate.

Table 31: Percent of Service Episodes with Follow-up Events by Program Area from Cases Closed in CY 2014

Program Area	Sample Size	Referral	Assess	Founded	Case	Placed	Any DYC*	DYC Commit*
Statewide	20,018	46.2	30.2	5.7	9.8	5.1	9.3	0.7
PA3 Services	123	24.4	13.8	1.6	5.7	0.0	2.5	1.3
PA4 Cases	1,648	46.2	32.6	1.3	21.4	9.0	28.6	2.8
PA5 Cases	18,230	46.3	30.1	6.1	8.8	4.7	4.2	0.2

\*Sample size of 79 for PA3, 1,623 for PA4, 5,958 for PA5, and 7,675 for statewide. 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 32 shows the follow-up outcomes by provider type based on service episodes with a PA4 designation from all cases closed in CY 2014. County provided service episodes had a 49% subsequent referral rate, a 35% subsequent assessment rate, a 1% subsequent founded assessment rate, a 23% subsequent case rate, a 8% subsequent placement rate, a 28% subsequent DYC placement (any DYC) rate, and a 2% subsequent DYC commitment rate. Purchased service episodes had a 45% subsequent referral rate, a 32% subsequent assessment rate, a 2% subsequent founded assessment rate, a 21% subsequent case rate, a 10% subsequent placement rate, a 29% subsequent DYC placement (any DYC) rate, and a 3% subsequent DYC commitment rate.

Table 32: Percent of PA4 Service Episodes with Follow-up Events by Provider Type from Cases Closed in CY 2014

Provider Type	Sample Size	Referral	Assess	Founded	Case	Placed	Any DYC*	DYC Commit*
Statewide	1,648	46.2	32.6	1.3	21.4	9.0	28.6	2.8
County Provided	549	48.5	34.6	0.7	22.6	7.8	28.2	2.0
Purchased	1,099	45.1	31.7	1.6	20.8	9.6	28.8	3.1

\*Sample size of 542 for county provided, 1,081 for purchased, and 1,623 for statewide.

On the following page, Table 33 shows the follow-up outcomes by service type based on service episodes with a PA4 designation from all cases closed in CY 2014. Day treatment service episodes had the lowest subsequent referral, assessment, founded assessment, and case rates. Life skills service episodes had the lowest subsequent placement rates. Sexual abuse treatment had the lowest DYC placement and DYC commitment rates.



Table 34 (continued)

County*	Sample Size	Referral	Assess	Founded	Case	Placed	Any DYC	DYC Commit
Jackson	4	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jefferson	65	33.8	27.7	0.0	20.0	20.0	24.6	0.0
Kiowa	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
La Plata/San Juan	105	35.2	16.2	0.0	19.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lake	6	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Larimer	170	62.4	43.5	0.0	37.1	4.1	38.8	4.1
Las Animas	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Logan	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mesa	13	84.6	76.9	0.0	0.0	7.7	66.7	0.0
Moffat	14	92.9	14.3	7.1	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Montezuma	11	27.3	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Montrose	7	28.6	28.6	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	0.0
Morgan	22	50.0	18.2	0.0	18.2	18.2	18.2	0.0
Otero	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pitkin	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Prowers	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pueblo	227	35.7	28.6	0.9	13.7	8.8	28.6	0.4
Rio Grande/Mineral	9	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	66.7	0.0
Routt	3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Saguache	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0
Summit	9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0
Teller	9	77.8	55.6	0.0	22.2	22.2	55.6	0.0
Washington	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Weld	41	46.3	22.0	2.4	34.1	12.2	41.5	14.6
Yuma	9	33.3	11.1	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

\* Baca, Cheyenne, Clear Creek, Crowley, Custer, Dolores, Gunnison/Hinsdale, Huerfano, Kit Carson, Lincoln, Ouray/San Miguel, Park, Phillips, Rio Blanco, and Sedgwick counties had no eligible service episodes for this analysis.

### 3.3.4. Program Area 5 Follow-Up Outcome Results

Table 35 shows the follow-up outcomes by provider type based on service episodes with a PA5 designation from all cases closed in CY 2014. County provided service episodes had a 44% subsequent referral rate, a 28% subsequent assessment rate, a 5% subsequent founded assessment rate, a 9% subsequent case rate, a 5% subsequent placement rate, a 4% subsequent DYC placement (any DYC) rate, and a 0% subsequent DYC commitment rate. Purchased service episodes had a 48% subsequent referral rate, a 32% subsequent assessment rate, a 7% subsequent founded assessment rate, a 9% subsequent case rate, a 5% subsequent placement rate, a 4% subsequent DYC placement (any DYC) rate, and a 0% subsequent DYC commitment rate.

Table 35: Percent of PA5 Service Episodes with Follow-up Events by Provider Type from Cases Closed in CY 2014

Provider Type	Sample Size	Referral	Assess	Founded	Case	Placed	Any DYC*	DYC Commit*
Statewide	18,230	46.3	30.1	6.1	8.8	4.7	4.2	0.2
County Provided	7,258	44.4	27.5	5.4	9.2	4.7	4.1	0.2
Purchased	10,972	47.6	31.9	6.7	8.5	4.7	4.2	0.2

\*Sample size of 2,291 for county, 3,667 for purchased, and 5,958 for statewide.

On the following page, Table 36 shows the follow-up outcomes by service type based on service episodes with a PA5 designation from all cases closed in CY 2014. Sexual abuse treatment service episodes had the lowest subsequent referral, assessment, founded, case, and placement rates, while substance abuse treatment had the lowest DYC placement rates.

Table 36: Percent of PA5 Service Episodes with Follow-up Events by Service Type from Cases Closed in CY 2014

Service Type	Sample Size	Referral	Assess	Founded	Case	Placed	Any DYC*	DYC Commit*
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>18,230</b>	<b>46.3</b>	<b>30.1</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>0.2</b>
County Designed	5,341	46.6	29.4	6.2	10.3	5.4	4.6	0.3
Day Treatment	29	58.6	44.8	3.4	3.4	6.9	25.0	0.0
Home-Based Interventions	2,178	47.3	32.7	6.3	8.2	4.2	4.8	0.1
Intensive Family Therapy	1,627	42.7	27.0	4.3	5.9	3.1	2.4	0.2
Life Skills	1,635	52.0	31.5	6.4	10.9	5.6	3.9	0.0
Mental Health	1,715	48.0	30.9	6.5	10.3	5.4	5.5	0.0
Sexual Abuse Treatment	340	36.5	15.3	1.5	1.2	0.3	3.4	0.0
Special Economic Assistance	2,495	44.8	28.6	6.4	7.2	4.4	4.4	0.3
Substance Abuse Treatment	2,870	45.4	33.0	7.0	8.2	4.7	2.1	0.0

\*Sample size of 1,774 for county designed services, 24 for day treatment, 706 for home-based services, 549 for intensive family therapy, 509 for life skills, 671 for mental health services, 176 for sexual abuse treatment, 793 for special economic assistance, 756 for substance abuse treatment, and 5,958 for statewide.

Table 37 shows that, statewide, 46% of services episodes associated with PA5 designation had a subsequent referral, 30% had a subsequent assessment, 6% had a subsequent founded assessment, 9% had a subsequent case, 5% had a subsequent placement, 4% had a subsequent DYC placement, and less than 1% had a subsequent DYC commitment.

Table 37: Percent of PA5 Service Episodes with Follow-up Events by County from Cases Closed in CY 2014

County*	Sample Size	Referral	Assess	Founded	Case	Placement	Any DYC	DYC Commit
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>18,230</b>	<b>46.3</b>	<b>30.1</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>0.2</b>
Adams	2,155	47.1	30.5	6.9	5.5	3.6	3.6	0.7
Alamosa	87	48.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arapahoe	1,125	44.8	28.0	5.0	9.7	3.4	7.3	0.0
Archuleta	32	25.0	15.6	3.1	12.5	9.4	0.0	0.0
Baca	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bent	42	57.1	23.8	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Boulder	462	63.4	50.0	13.6	16.9	9.7	11.0	0.0
Broomfield	83	60.2	60.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Chaffee	27	7.4	7.4	0.0	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cheyenne	4	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	N/A
Clear Creek	19	68.4	68.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	0.0
Conejos	24	29.2	12.5	0.0	4.2	4.2	0.0	0.0
Costilla	28	71.4	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Crowley	8	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	N/A
Delta	35	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Denver	1,634	38.6	24.1	7.4	8.3	6.7	5.5	0.8
Douglas	258	74.8	20.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0
Eagle	163	50.9	34.4	12.3	12.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
El Paso	3,958	44.3	30.9	5.5	4.2	3.0	0.1	0.0
Elbert	97	62.9	21.6	5.2	5.2	5.2	0.0	0.0

Table 37 (continued)

County*	Sample Size	Referral	Assess	Founded	Case	Placement	Any DYC	DYC Commit
Fremont	975	37.0	24.4	1.5	11.5	6.1	1.5	0.0
Garfield	147	72.1	47.6	33.3	7.5	4.1	6.9	0.0
Gilpin	3	100.0	66.7	66.7	66.7	66.7	0.0	0.0
Grand	39	28.2	12.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gunnison/ Hinsdale	16	81.2	62.5	31.2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Huerfano	42	45.2	23.8	4.8	14.3	0.0	16.7	0.0
Jefferson	1,095	49.2	34.6	5.9	4.8	2.7	5.6	0.3
Kit Carson	9	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
La Plata/ San Juan	216	50.0	38.4	4.6	28.2	3.7	36.7	0.0
Lake	35	97.1	85.7	68.6	57.1	57.1	0.0	0.0
Larimer	2,478	46.5	25.9	2.2	13.6	4.7	3.4	0.0
Las Animas	23	65.2	30.4	13.0	13.0	13.0	0.0	0.0
Lincoln	24	45.8	12.5	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Logan	139	32.4	12.9	0.0	2.9	2.9	0.0	0.0
Mesa	347	60.5	36.9	13.5	12.4	10.7	2.1	0.0
Moffat	7	42.9	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Montezuma	36	66.7	58.3	25.0	61.1	33.3	0.0	0.0
Montrose	148	54.1	27.7	4.7	8.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Morgan	195	71.8	53.8	24.6	32.8	14.9	1.6	0.0
Otero	74	40.5	31.1	4.1	2.7	2.7	0.0	0.0
Ouray/ San Miguel	17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Park	42	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Phillips	9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	N/A
Pitkin	31	61.3	51.6	48.4	48.4	48.4	0.0	0.0
Prowers	44	31.8	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pueblo	855	25.1	18.7	4.2	5.5	4.3	3.6	0.0
Rio Blanco	13	92.3	92.3	30.8	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rio Grande/ Mineral	79	57.0	44.3	3.8	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Routt	41	22.0	9.8	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Saguache	24	62.5	54.2	4.2	54.2	4.2	0.0	0.0
Sedgwick	7	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	N/A
Summit	41	24.4	24.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Teller	121	52.1	33.1	0.0	8.3	8.3	0.0	0.0
Washington	8	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Weld	550	68.4	49.3	13.1	17.8	12.4	15.7	0.0
Yuma	56	82.1	60.7	10.7	10.7	10.7	0.0	0.0

\* Custer, Dolores, Jackson, Kiowa, and 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 2015. 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 38, the total Core Service expenditures were \$47,426,375 in CY 2015. Fee-for-service contract costs were \$25,567,709, which comprised 54% of total expenditures. Fixed-rate contract costs were \$7,484,595, which comprised 16% of total expenditures. County provided services costs were \$14,374,071, which comprised 30% of total expenditures.<sup>2</sup> This represents a 4.2% increase in Core Services expenditures from CY 2014.

Table 38: Total Core Services Expenditures by Contract Type in CY 2015

Contract Type	Total	Percent
Fee-for-Service Contracts	\$25,567,709	53.9
Fixed-Rate Contracts	\$7,484,595	15.8
County Provided Services	\$14,374,071	30.3
<b>Total Core Expenditures</b>	<b>\$47,426,375</b>	<b>100.0</b>

#### 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 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 39 shows that the average cost per service episode for all therapeutic Core Service episodes closed in CY 2015 was \$2,181 with an average service duration of 133 days. For therapeutic assessments/evaluations, the average cost per service episode was \$565 with an average service duration of 39 days, which represents a decrease of 7.0% or \$42 in average cost per service episode from CY 2014. For therapeutic interventions, the average cost per service episode was \$2,454 with an average service duration of 149 days, which represents a decrease of 4.1% or \$106 in average cost per service episode from CY 2014.

Table 39: Average Cost per Service Episode and Average Service Duration (in days) for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2015

Service Category	Sample Size	Average Cost per Episode	Average Service Duration
Therapeutic Assessments/Evaluations	1,604	\$565	39
Therapeutic Interventions	9,496	\$2,454	149
<b>All Therapeutic Services</b>	<b>11,100</b>	<b>\$2,181</b>	<b>133</b>

<sup>2</sup> This number does not account for county salaried staff who directly provide Core Services and for whom service authorizations are not entered.

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. As displayed in Table 40, service episodes with a remain home service goal had an average cost per service episode for therapeutic assessments/evaluations of \$441 and an average cost per service episode for therapeutic interventions of \$2,512. Service episodes with a return home service goal had an average cost per service episode for therapeutic assessments/evaluations of \$644 and an average cost per service episode for therapeutic interventions of \$2,326.

Table 40: Average Cost per Service Episode and Average Cost Duration (in days) by Service Goal for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2015

Service Goal	Therapeutic Assessments/Evaluations			Therapeutic Interventions		
	Sample Size	Cost	Duration	Sample Size	Cost	Duration
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>1,604</b>	<b>\$565</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>9,496</b>	<b>\$2,454</b>	<b>149</b>
Least Restrictive Setting	23	\$882	35	219	\$4,008	218
Remain Home	651	\$441	27	4,562	\$2,512	142
Return Home	930	\$644	48	4,715	\$2,326	152

As displayed in Table 41, service episodes with a PA3 designation had an average cost per service episode for therapeutic assessments/evaluations of \$74, and an average cost per service episode for therapeutic interventions of \$1,388. Service episodes with a PA4 designation had an average cost per service episode for therapeutic assessments/evaluations of \$782, and an average cost per service episode for therapeutic interventions of \$2,970. Service episodes with a PA5 designation had an average cost per service episode for therapeutic assessments/evaluations of \$592, and an average cost per service episode for therapeutic interventions of \$2,266. Because prevention services are 100% voluntary, the cost per service episode for PA3 are not directly comparable with the other program areas.

Table 41: Average Cost per Service Episode and Average Cost Duration (in days) by Program Area for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2015

Program Area	Therapeutic Assessments/Evaluations			Therapeutic Interventions		
	Sample Size	Cost	Duration	Sample Size	Cost	Duration
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>1,604</b>	<b>\$565</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>9,496</b>	<b>\$2,454</b>	<b>149</b>
PA3 Services	143	\$74	4	365	\$1,388	112
PA4 Cases	181	\$782	27	2,077	\$2,970	145
PA5 Cases	1,251	\$592	45	6,856	\$2,266	148
PA6 Cases	29	\$482	31	198	\$5,518	287

On the following page, Table 42 shows that substance abuse treatment had the lowest average cost per service episode for therapeutic assessments/evaluations at \$165 followed by county designed at \$232. Home-based interventions had the highest average cost per service episode at \$1,065 for therapeutic assessments/evaluations followed by mental health at \$1,038. For therapeutic interventions, substance abuse treatment had the lowest average cost per episode at \$1,056 followed by intensive family therapy at \$1,526. Day treatment had the highest average cost per episode for therapeutic interventions at \$5,746 followed by home-based interventions at \$3,510.

Table 42: Average Cost per Service Episode and Average Cost Duration (in days) by Service Type for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2015

Service Type	Therapeutic Assessments/Evaluations			Therapeutic Interventions		
	Sample Size	Cost	Duration	Sample Size	Cost	Duration
Statewide	1,604	\$565	39	9,496	\$2,454	149
County Designed	469	\$232	8	2,515	\$2,582	136
Day Treatment	--	--	--	147	\$5,746	144
Home-Based Interventions	223	\$889	2	2,011	\$3,510	131
Intensive Family Therapy	92	\$394	18	839	\$1,526	187
Life Skills	11	\$1,065	31	1,043	\$2,398	155
Mental Health	426	\$1,038	46	1,326	\$2,136	144
Sexual Abuse Treatment	126	\$527	21	310	\$2,940	191
Substance Abuse Treatment	257	\$165	133	1,305	\$1,056*	165

\* 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 43 shows the average cost per service episode and average service duration by county for all therapeutic services closed in CY 2015. 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 43: Average Cost per Service Episode and Average Service Duration (in Days) for Service Episodes Closed in CY 2015 by County

County*	Average Cost Per Episode	Average Service Duration	Sample Size
Statewide	\$2,181	133	11,100
Adams	\$2,568	95	975
Alamosa	\$2,056	150	104
Arapahoe	\$3,309	139	400
Archuleta	\$3,583	116	19
Baca	\$1,122	81	5
Bent	\$2,484	96	20
Boulder	\$5,800	246	313
Broomfield	\$3,393	197	73
Chaffee	\$1,678	191	5
Cheyenne	\$6,981	374	5
Clear Creek	\$2,837	173	14
Conejos	\$4,243	124	51
Costilla	\$2,221	262	34
Crowley	\$3,249	138	6
Custer	\$630	106	2
Delta	\$3,304	220	65
Denver	\$3,135	117	1,355
Dolores	\$1,608	188	1
Douglas	\$2,510	124	238
Eagle	\$1,361	110	58
El Paso	\$1,510	124	3,001
Elbert	\$1,788	110	29
Fremont	\$6,002	191	43
Garfield	\$593	62	35
Gilpin	\$3,198	151	13

Table 43 (continued)

County*	Average Cost Per Episode	Average Service Duration	Sample Size
Grand	\$3,116	139	35
Huerfano	\$752	138	1
Jackson	\$2,773	140	3
Jefferson	\$1,648	123	1,397
Kiowa	\$1,229	190	5
Kit Carson	\$93	28	2
La Plata/San Juan	\$4,719	245	76
Lake	\$1,946	98	5
Larimer	\$1,347	109	905
Las Animas	\$951	177	22
Lincoln	\$3,545	150	17
Logan	\$2,374	197	56
Mesa	\$1,048	198	672
Moffat	\$2,543	264	72
Montezuma	\$5,015	319	16
Montrose	\$4,747	439	5
Morgan	\$2,485	158	77
Otero	\$2,659	174	38
Ouray/San Miguel	\$3,804	484	2
Park	\$3,473	225	9
Phillips	\$972	98	5
Pitkin	\$1,169	117	32
Prowers	\$1,533	0	3
Pueblo	\$1,621	92	251
Rio Blanco	\$946	109	19
Rio Grande/Mineral	\$2,798	140	19
Routt	\$11,079	192	11
Saguache	\$3,620	218	12
Sedgwick	\$560	19	1
Summit	\$2,821	221	24
Teller	\$1,087	94	35
Washington	\$3,615	191	18
Weld	\$3,440	146	309
Yuma	\$816	127	82

\* Gunnison/Hinsdale 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 44, the average cost per client statewide for CY 2015 was \$1,787 based on total expenditures of \$47,426,375 and 26,533 clients served. This represents an increase of 1.5% or \$26 in average cost per client from CY 2014.

Table 44: Average Cost per Client by County in CY 2015

County	Expenditures	Clients Served*	Average Cost per Client
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>\$47,426,375</b>	<b>26,533</b>	<b>\$1,787</b>
Adams	\$4,773,921	2,373	\$2,012
Alamosa	\$489,400	270	\$1,813
Arapahoe	\$4,499,217	2,707	\$1,662
Archuleta	\$234,518	117	\$2,004
Baca	\$50,220	8	\$6,278
Bent	\$78,571	48	\$1,637
Boulder	\$1,691,570	936	\$1,807

Table 44 (continued)

County	Expenditures	Clients Served*	Average Cost per Client
Broomfield	\$302,257	119	\$2,540
Chaffee	\$205,378	60	\$3,423
Cheyenne	\$31,764	19	\$1,672
Clear Creek	\$68,663	43	\$1,597
Conejos	\$160,416	116	\$1,383
Costilla	\$114,014	94	\$1,213
Crowley	\$74,799	18	\$4,156
Custer	\$11,760	10	\$1,176
Delta	\$238,111	165	\$1,443
Denver	\$7,418,033	2,457	\$3,019
Dolores	\$14,711	2	\$7,355
Douglas	\$919,407	550	\$1,672
Eagle	\$202,283	127	\$1,593
El Paso	\$6,340,042	4,129	\$1,535
Elbert	\$167,683	109	\$1,538
Fremont	\$664,809	483	\$1,376
Garfield	\$192,241	165	\$1,165
Gilpin	\$45,396	42	\$1,081
Grand	\$197,433	64	\$3,085
Gunnison/Hinsdale	\$99,246	83	\$1,196
Huerfano	\$95,675	37	\$2,586
Jackson	\$4,835	3	\$1,612
Jefferson	\$4,375,736	1,974	\$2,217
Kiowa	\$51,588	18	\$2,866
Kit Carson	\$148,380	56	\$2,650
La Plata/San Juan	\$902,570	355	\$2,542
Lake	\$89,536	43	\$2,082
Larimer	\$3,034,414	2,828	\$1,073
Las Animas	\$103,701	116	\$894
Lincoln	\$271,894	75	\$3,625
Logan	\$423,453	222	\$1,907
Mesa	\$1,577,662	913	\$1,728
Moffat	\$237,381	121	\$1,962
Montezuma	\$269,444	51	\$5,283
Montrose	\$396,501	359	\$1,104
Morgan	\$569,876	304	\$1,875
Otero	\$181,816	121	\$1,503
Ouray/San Miguel	\$287,588	27	\$10,651
Park	\$104,593	74	\$1,413
Phillips	\$28,549	14	\$2,039
Pitkin	\$78,894	40	\$1,972
Prowers	\$213,002	124	\$1,718
Pueblo	\$1,309,688	1,143	\$1,146
Rio Blanco	\$27,563	78	\$353
Rio Grande/Mineral	\$125,693	88	\$1,428
Routt	\$201,035	49	\$4,103
Saguache	\$95,943	45	\$2,132
Sedgwick	\$15,810	1	\$15,810
Summit	\$182,737	78	\$2,343
Teller	\$236,257	207	\$1,141
Washington	\$71,093	45	\$1,580
Weld	\$2,248,317	1,361	\$1,652
Yuma	\$179,286	249	\$720

\* 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 45, the average cost per child/youth statewide for CY 2015 was \$2,969 based on total expenditures of \$47,426,375 and 15,975 children/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services. This represents an increase of 1.5% or \$43 in average cost per child/youth receiving or benefitting from Core Services from CY 2014.

Table 45: Average Cost per Child/Youth by County in CY 2015

County	Expenditures	Child/Youth Receiving or Benefitting*	Average Cost per Child/Youth
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>\$47,426,375</b>	<b>15,975</b>	<b>\$2,969</b>
Adams	\$4,773,921	1,550	\$3,080
Alamosa	\$489,400	201	\$2,435
Arapahoe	\$4,499,217	1,610	\$2,795
Archuleta	\$234,518	64	\$3,664
Baca	\$50,220	7	\$7,174
Bent	\$78,571	27	\$2,910
Boulder	\$1,691,570	462	\$3,661
Broomfield	\$302,257	111	\$2,723
Chaffee	\$205,378	45	\$4,564
Cheyenne	\$31,764	8	\$3,971
Clear Creek	\$68,663	25	\$2,747
Conejos	\$160,416	94	\$1,707
Costilla	\$114,014	77	\$1,481
Crowley	\$74,799	20	\$3,740
Custer	\$11,760	5	\$2,352
Delta	\$238,111	107	\$2,225
Denver	\$7,418,033	1,733	\$4,280
Dolores	\$14,711	5	\$2,942
Douglas	\$919,407	285	\$3,226
Eagle	\$202,283	67	\$3,019
El Paso	\$6,340,042	2,135	\$2,970
Elbert	\$167,683	67	\$2,503
Fremont	\$664,809	293	\$2,269
Garfield	\$192,241	119	\$1,615
Gilpin	\$45,396	17	\$2,670
Grand	\$197,433	46	\$4,292
Gunnison/Hinsdale	\$99,246	48	\$2,068
Huerfano	\$95,675	31	\$3,086
Jackson	\$4,835	4	\$1,209
Jefferson	\$4,375,736	1,395	\$3,137
Kiowa	\$51,588	10	\$5,159
Kit Carson	\$148,380	25	\$5,935
La Plata/San Juan	\$902,570	214	\$4,218
Lake	\$89,536	23	\$3,893
Larimer	\$3,034,414	1,443	\$2,103
Las Animas	\$103,701	78	\$1,330
Lincoln	\$271,894	46	\$5,911
Logan	\$423,453	114	\$3,715
Mesa	\$1,577,662	614	\$2,569
Moffat	\$237,381	65	\$3,652
Montezuma	\$269,444	56	\$4,812
Montrose	\$396,501	192	\$2,065
Morgan	\$569,876	171	\$3,333

Table 45 (continued)

County	Expenditures	Child/Youth Receiving or Benefitting*	Average Cost per Child/Youth
Otero	\$181,816	112	\$1,623
Ouray/San Miguel	\$287,588	24	\$11,983
Park	\$104,593	32	\$3,269
Phillips	\$28,549	12	\$2,379
Pitkin	\$78,894	27	\$2,922
Prowers	\$213,002	71	\$3,000
Pueblo	\$1,309,688	697	\$1,879
Rio Blanco	\$27,563	38	\$725
Rio Grande/Mineral	\$125,693	49	\$2,565
Routt	\$201,035	41	\$4,903
Saguache	\$95,943	22	\$4,361
Sedgwick	\$15,810	2	\$7,905
Summit	\$182,737	38	\$4,809
Teller	\$236,257	102	\$2,316
Washington	\$71,093	27	\$2,633
Weld	\$2,248,317	816	\$2,755
Yuma	\$179,286	156	\$1,149

\* 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 \$46 million on out-of-home placements in CY 2015.

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 217 involved days in CY 2015.
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 \$112,272,993 and an estimated cost of \$157,918,317, an additional **\$45,645,324** would have been spent by county agencies statewide in CY 2015 if OOH placements had been provided exclusively instead of a combination of Core Services and OOH placements. This equates to an additional \$13 per child/youth per involved day and represents a cost efficiency ratio of .41 statewide. Table 46 shows the average cost difference per involved day, the overall cost efficiency, and the cost efficiency ratio by county for CY 2015.

Table 46: *Estimated Core Services Cost Efficiency by County for CY 2015*

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	349,490	\$42.19	\$29.82	\$12.37	\$4,322,420	.41
Alamosa	46,601	\$34.36	\$21.21	\$13.16	\$613,217	.62
Arapahoe	349,712	\$41.02	\$33.04	\$7.97	\$2,788,468	.24
Archuleta	13,076	\$30.90	\$22.33	\$8.58	\$112,129	.38
Baca	1,759	\$72.40	\$58.72	\$13.68	\$24,060	.23
Bent	4,968	\$22.26	\$20.22	\$2.04	\$10,156	.10
Boulder	111,175	\$54.57	\$33.24	\$21.33	\$2,371,106	.64
Broomfield	24,290	\$59.25	\$25.94	\$33.31	\$809,171	1.28
Chaffee	9,018	\$47.08	\$29.97	\$17.10	\$154,251	.57
Cheyenne	1,410	\$28.17	\$35.40	-\$7.22	-\$10,184	-.20
Clear Creek	7,720	\$53.62	\$62.88	-\$9.26	-\$71,479	-.15
Conejos	19,337	\$22.24	\$14.50	\$7.74	\$149,592	.53
Costilla	15,366	\$47.77	\$14.91	\$32.85	\$504,843	2.20
Crowley	5,005	\$39.39	\$38.57	\$0.81	\$4,074	.02
Custer	1,088	\$49.09	\$29.53	\$19.56	\$21,280	.66
Delta	23,885	\$63.75	\$44.28	\$19.47	\$465,025	.44
Denver	397,520	\$40.75	\$40.30	\$0.45	\$177,824	.01
Dolores	845	\$104.40	\$19.21	\$85.18	\$71,979	4.43
Douglas	68,604	\$96.96	\$38.26	\$58.69	\$4,026,572	1.53
Eagle	14,638	\$110.65	\$23.61	\$87.04	\$1,274,053	3.69
El Paso	446,019	\$44.14	\$34.56	\$9.58	\$4,271,672	.28
Elbert	18,700	\$65.62	\$18.66	\$46.96	\$878,167	2.52
Fremont	65,903	\$44.31	\$28.20	\$16.11	\$1,061,816	.57
Garfield	23,749	\$56.40	\$27.00	\$29.39	\$698,059	1.09
Gilpin	4,952	\$83.19	\$55.04	\$28.16	\$139,448	.51
Grand	9,922	\$53.57	\$27.38	\$26.20	\$259,942	.96
Gunnison/ Hinsdale	8,718	\$12.76	\$12.03	\$0.73	\$6,363	.06
Huerfano	7,912	\$68.51	\$24.32	\$44.19	\$349,651	1.82
Jackson	683	\$188.68	\$69.79	\$118.89	\$81,205	1.70
Jefferson	291,784	\$48.34	\$39.04	\$9.30	\$2,712,331	.24
Kiowa	2,783	\$44.10	\$52.22	-\$8.12	-\$22,606	-.16
Kit Carson	3,764	\$82.09	\$61.03	\$21.06	\$79,279	.35
La Plata/ San Juan	37,429	\$48.69	\$26.17	\$22.53	\$843,161	.86
Lake	5,207	\$32.08	\$21.94	\$10.14	\$52,816	.46
Larimer	286,579	\$19.47	\$15.74	\$3.73	\$1,069,036	.24
Las Animas	17,906	\$41.65	\$32.82	\$8.82	\$158,007	.27
Lincoln	11,475	\$68.72	\$55.40	\$13.32	\$152,842	.24
Logan	30,681	\$67.69	\$36.74	\$30.95	\$949,642	.84
Mesa	140,293	\$60.10	\$49.66	\$10.44	\$1,464,167	.21
Moffat	16,054	\$76.38	\$25.37	\$51.01	\$818,994	2.01
Montezuma	14,673	\$91.25	\$46.99	\$44.26	\$649,452	.94

Table 46 (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	49,353	\$86.73	\$31.57	\$55.16	\$2,722,392	1.75
Morgan	38,913	\$63.66	\$36.75	\$26.91	\$1,047,260	.73
Otero	20,586	\$31.81	\$23.50	\$8.32	\$171,212	.35
Ouray/ San Miguel	4,485	\$64.00	\$75.41	-\$11.41	-\$51,192	-.15
Park	7,074	\$56.38	\$44.04	\$12.35	\$87,333	.28
Phillips	3,253	\$31.68	\$31.88	-\$0.20	-\$649	-.01
Pitkin	4,340	\$97.73	\$24.17	\$73.56	\$319,262	3.04
Prowers	13,134	\$6.91	\$17.68	-\$10.78	-\$141,520	-.61
Pueblo	152,737	\$31.52	\$27.72	\$3.80	\$581,015	.14
Rio Blanco	6,115	\$19.03	\$9.39	\$9.64	\$58,922	1.03
Rio Grande/ Mineral	11,102	\$70.84	\$32.32	\$38.52	\$427,636	1.19
Routt	9,434	\$85.52	\$21.83	\$63.68	\$600,787	2.92
Saguache	4,697	\$107.31	\$34.67	\$72.64	\$341,205	2.10
Sedgwick	195	\$0.00	\$81.08	-\$81.08	-\$15,810	-1.00
Summit	9,511	\$112.61	\$36.30	\$76.31	\$725,802	2.10
Teller	19,230	\$42.17	\$29.43	\$12.74	\$244,935	.43
Washington	4,905	\$20.67	\$22.01	-\$1.34	-\$6,567	-.06
Weld	168,839	\$44.37	\$29.78	\$14.60	\$2,464,411	.49
Yuma	30,235	\$61.99	\$9.84	\$52.15	\$1,576,890	5.30

## 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, 75% 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, 48% agreed or strongly agreed that there are specific services needed in their county that are not currently available. These services include: day treatment (65%), sexual abuse treatment (38%), intensive family therapy (34%), substance abuse treatment (31%), county designed services (28%) including domestic violence, trauma-informed, and animal assisted therapy, life skills (14%), mental health services (14%), and home-based interventions (3%).

Overall, 75% 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.

Similarly, 73% of counties agreed or strongly agreed that the **capacity** of Core Services in their community is adequate to address the needs of children, youth, and families. However, 50% reported that not all services were available at an adequate capacity. These services include: substance abuse treatment (53%), mental health services (43%), home-based services (27%), day treatment (27%), sexual abuse treatment (23%), county designed services (17%) including bilingual and trauma focused mental health services, intensive family therapy (13%), life skills (13%), and special economic assistance (7%). As stated by one coordinator “(Lack of) access to quality

psychiatric care has impacted children’s ability to move from higher levels of care to lower. Conversely, the inability to have frequent contact with a psychiatrist or med management has impacted children’s ability to reside at home and in the community.” Another coordinator noted that, “Weekend and after hours availability for mental health and substance abuse treatment services is 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. Meeting regularly with community partners such as mental health centers
2. Working with providers on scheduling and waiting lists
3. Recruiting new providers particularly for substance abuse treatment
4. Working to get more trained clinicians especially for trauma informed services
5. Being more creative with financing including responding to Request for Proposals
6. Partnering with Behavioral Health Organizations to increase Medicaid eligible services

When asked about service accessibility, 47% 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 substance abuse treatment (79%), mental health services (64%), day treatment (46%), sexual abuse treatment (43%), home-based interventions (29%), life skills (29%), county designed services (25%), intensive family therapy (21%), and special economic assistance (11%).

Transportation was mentioned as the most frequent barrier when services are not provided in the home. According to one coordinator, “Many of our clients do not have reliable transportation and money for gas to get to the treatment centers that are located 50 to 60 miles one way.” Another coordinator stated, “Sometimes we ask service providers to travel a great distance to meet with families and we are unable to pay mileage reimbursement so providers are often unwilling.” The second most common barrier is limited staff and therapist capacity at local service providers, especially in rural communities. As stated by one coordinator, “We have no consistent providers for mental health, and our crisis response is done by iPad and Skype.” The third most common barrier is serving clients receiving Medicaid in regard to denial of services, low reimbursement rates, and waitlists. For example, “The process of locating a provider who will accept Medicaid and who has experience with families who are involved in the child welfare system is often difficult to find.” Other barriers include identifying bilingual providers, sharing confidential information, and engaging families in the treatment process.

Again, counties are actively trying to resolve service barriers. For example, “What has worked well, is ongoing quarterly meetings with providers currently under contract to brainstorm and go over outcomes.” Coordinators offered the following strategies to address barriers to service accessibility in their counties:

1. Finding creative solutions to enhance transportation options (e.g., ride shares, gas vouchers)
2. Strengthening collaborations with providers to enhance consistency and intensity of services
3. Offering more home-based services
4. Developing innovative county designed services
5. Expanding provider networks including 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 is about providing the right service at the right time with optimal frequency to meet the individual needs of each family member.”

1. Collaborative partnerships with providers
2. Funding for prevention services
3. Expanded continuum of providers
4. Wide array of services including trauma-specific
5. Feedback from caseworkers on service gaps and provider efficacy
6. Availability of private therapists
7. Services tailored to meet individual needs
8. Creative funding including braided and blended resources
9. Intensive in-home services
10. Effective county-designed services
11. Valid and up-front assessments to determine family risks and needs
12. Seamless referral processes allow for quicker service authorization and initiation
13. Use of best practices/evidence-based practices
14. Increased flexibility in Core Services funding
15. Community involvement and outreach

When asked what is not working well with service delivery, the following challenges were mentioned in order of frequency: (1) demand for more clinicians/therapists, (2) lack of transportation to services, (3) inconsistency with mental health providers, (4) shortage of Medicaid providers, (5) limited funding/resources to serve all families, (6) scarcity of culturally responsive services, (7) misalignment between service availability and judicial requests and timelines, (8) need for more responsive substance abuse treatment, (9) timeliness of service provision, and (10) development of accountability expectations with providers. These challenges are especially pressing in rural counties. As stated by one coordinator, “There are currently no substance abuse services available to our clients in our county. There is also very limited access to mental health services for both Medicaid clients and private pay or private insurance clients.”

Coordinators also were asked to describe programmatic or policy changes to the Core Services program designed to impact their county’s OOH placement rate or lengths of stay. Overall, counties reported that “innovative solutions have been identified that include creatively utilizing our current Core Services programs (which) has prompted the expansion of our Core Services to include new providers in order to safely maintain the child/youth at home.” The most frequently reported changes are the rise in kinship care placements, increases in the frequency and timing of family meetings, a pronounced shift toward greater family engagement, all of which have “served to shorten agency intervention and length of stay when there is no alternative to placement.”

“The adoption of the family engagement model has resulted in a stronger voice for the family and empowered them to make effective changes that lead to alternatives for out-of-home placements.”

Coordinators noted other practice changes including the implementation of front-loaded services, in-home mentoring and monitoring, after-care services, intensive community-based services, and county designed services as alternatives to OOH placements that assist children to successfully transition into the community. Diligent search and intensive family finding also were mentioned as key practices in this regard. Many counties reported working collaboratively with state and local initiatives including Differential Response, Partnering for Safety Training, Juvenile courts, and Dependency and Neglect System Reform. In addition, several counties are utilizing service navigators to improve Core Services delivery. Another practice trend is trauma screening, assessment, and

“We are starting to see the impact of the flexibility to utilize PA3 services. This simple shift has created support for children, youth and families in our community so that we (or another agency) can get involved and support them before deeper intervention and involvement through child welfare is required.”

treatment, which is “aimed at increasing protective factors and resiliency skills for children and families.” Lastly, specific permanency programs like Permanency Roundtables, kinship supports, adoption support services, and Permanency Review Teams are being implemented to enhance the permanency of children and youth.

From a policy perspective, coordinators indicated that prevention programs positively impacted OOH placement rates and length of stay. Specifically, programs like SafeCare Colorado and Colorado Community Response emphasize parenting classes and economic supports to provide resources and voluntary services to families who would otherwise not be served. Furthermore, the Collaborative Management Program and IV-E waiver interventions (e.g., Kinship Supports) were mentioned as approaches to avoid OOH placements and decrease the length of stay in OOH care. However, several coordinators mentioned that court intervention giving “youth in conflict” cases to the Department of Human Services has increased residential placements in their counties. This is illustrated by a coordinator who stated, “The community and judicial are very conservative and seeking line of sight supervision for our teen population that can’t be provided for in all instances and as a result youth are ordered out of their home (more often at a higher level of care).”

### 5.3. Service Collaboration

Table 47 shows that the most prevalent collaborative efforts in CY 2015 were the Nurse Family Partnership (NFP) at 72%, Collaborative Management Program (CMP) at 67%, SafeCare Colorado (SCC) at 62%, Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) at 57%, and other collaborative efforts at 50%, which included the IV-E Waiver interventions, partnerships with local school districts and courts (e.g., drug court, Crossover Youth Practice model, Best Practice Court teams), Systems of Care, and Early Childhood Councils.

Table 47: Participation in Collaborative Efforts in CY 2015 (N = 60)

Collaboration Type	Frequency	Percent*
Nurse-Family Partnership	43	71.7
Collaborative Management Program	40	66.7
SafeCare Colorado	37	61.7
Promoting Safe and Stable Families	34	56.7
Other Collaborative Efforts	30	50.0
Colorado Community Response (CCR)	27	45.0
Collaborative Efforts with Family to Family Principles	22	36.7
Family to Family	7	11.7

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

Beyond the aforementioned collaborative efforts, counties partner with various community institutions, including mental health centers, law enforcement, school districts, private providers, and other family-serving agencies. Coordinators were asked to describe how these collaborations may have impacted the service effectiveness and service goal attainment outcomes for the Core Services Program. The most frequently reported impact was the ability to focus on and align with individual needs of the family, which can improve family engagement and lead to better outcomes. As stated by one coordinator, “Our partnerships at all levels from prevention to high-risk involvement come to the table to discuss appropriate plans, and effective services to be delivered to address need.” These “Collaborative efforts bring different agencies that have dissimilar outcome measures together to gain better understanding of what the overall goals of the individual agencies are and to find common points.”

“The collaborative efforts are designed to reach families through a preventative means and also address difficult to serve families that touch multiple systems. Through this combined effort, service gaps can be identified and services that are available and having a positive impact on family outcomes can be discussed and reinforced.”

Another impact of collaboration is the involvement of non-DHS professionals in assisting families and the leveraging of resources and funding opportunities from different systems to make services available. One coordinator notes that “Families may be more responsive to other agencies who enter homes with a different purpose, but yet are aware of safety and well-being for all members in the home.” For example, collaborations have helped to increase the overall knowledge base and practice development for trauma-informed services. Such efforts also have

allowed counties to place a greater emphasis on prevention programs. Information sharing allows agencies and providers to work together more efficiently and effectively to deliver services to families.

Coordinators identified interagency participation in family meetings as an essential collaboration component that decreases duplication of services and increases seamless service coordination. The improved communication resulting from these meetings allows for enhanced case management and treatment plan development. Others mentioned the diverse continuum of services, identification of service gaps, blended funds, and progress monitoring arising from these partnerships have all positively impacted service effectiveness and service goal attainment rates.

## 5.4. Service Funding

The next section of the report inquired about Core Services funding in each county. For NFP, SCC, and CCR, 90% of counties reported that these prevention programs are supported by non-Core Services funds. 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.

“Overall, the County has been able to increase the continuum of services, both Core and non-Core funded, through flexible funding and collaborative efforts.”

As displayed in Table 48, coordinators enjoy the flexibility afforded them in developing county designed services while others would like even more flexibility in spending Core Services dollars. Coordinators see benefits in providing intensive in-home services but report difficulty in contracting for mental health services and substance abuse treatment. Some coordinators believe the allocation formula is equitable and appreciate receiving larger allocations, while other coordinators suggest that the allocation formula can be approved and report receiving smaller allocations. The use of regional contracts provides benefits for service providers in easily contracting with multiple counties, but creates additional challenges for families in caseworkers in accessing services. In addition, coordinators see benefits in using Core Services funding for prevention services while others would like even more flexibility in how these programs are funded.

Table 48: *Benefits and Challenges to Core Services Funding for CY 2015*

Funding Area	Benefits	Challenges
Flexibility	Core dollars can be spent to develop county designed services	Limitations/restrictions to how Core dollars can be used
Accessibility	Ability to provide intensive in-home 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
Regional Contracts	Service providers can easily contract with numerous counties	Creates additional challenges for families and caseworkers in accessing services
Prevention Services	Fluidity in spending from child welfare cases to prevention services	Finding flexible way to allocate funding for prevention services

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 prevention programs; (2) enhance funding for smaller and rural counties; (3) allow for more spending flexibility, especially for inpatient substance abuse treatment and mental health services; (4) 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 (5) evaluate the formula and understanding of the Core Services allocation. Other recommendations included allocating funds prior to contract fiscal year, tracking all service expenditures regardless of funding source in Trails, paying for prevention services without opening a case in Trails, and allowing counties to request reimbursement for administrative costs associated with county provided services.

## 6. Discussion

The discussion section of the Core Services Program Evaluation CY 2015 Report summarizes 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. Evaluation Conclusions

Similar to the previous two calendar year reports, 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, 100% of children/youth who received PA3 services remained home, which also indicates that the Core Services Program is serving the population targeted by the legislation. Furthermore, the Core Services Program is clearly 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.

“Core Services continues to provide significant financial support to this agency staff and our ability to provide services to families and children that we might not be able to provide otherwise.”

**Core Services are Effective in Achieving Treatment Success.** Approximately 80% of all service episodes in CY 2015 were determined to be successful or partially successful with 89% 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, 75% 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 79% of children/youth with an involvement closed in CY 2015. Similar to past evaluations, the remain home service goal was attained in 93% of service episodes when calculated based on if the child/youth had an open removal on the day the service ended. Life skills and mental health services had the highest remain home service goal attainment rates, while home-based interventions and sexual abuse treatment had the highest return home service goal attainment rate. Core Services coordinators reported that the rise in kinship care placements, increases in the frequency and timing of family meetings, a pronounced shift toward greater family engagement positively impacted service goal attainment outcomes.

**Core Services Impacts Subsequent Child Welfare Involvement.** For children/youth with a closed case in CY 2014, 45% of children/youth had a subsequent referral, 29% had a subsequent assessment, 5% had a subsequent founded assessment, 11% had a subsequent case, 5% had a subsequent placement, 11% had a subsequent DYC placement (detention or commitment), and 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.

**Core Services Provide Substantial Cost Efficiency for Colorado.** Without the Core Services Program, it is estimated that Colorado counties would have spent an additional \$46 million in CY 2015 on out-of-home placements for children/youth. Over the past three calendar years, an additional \$166 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 implementation of front-loaded services, in-home mentoring and monitoring, after-care services, intensive community-based services, and county designed services have positively impacted the decrease in OOH placement rates and OOH lengths of stay.

## 6.2. Evaluation Strengths

For the straight third 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.

## 6.3. Evaluation Limitations

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.

## 6.4. Evaluation Implications

“The culture within our agency continues to evolve in a positive manner, as we identify resources (both formal and informal) to ameliorate child maltreatment risks before they become safety concerns.”

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, prevention 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 positive findings for service effectiveness and service goal attainment indicate 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 in last year's report and continues in this year's report with the analysis of follow-up outcomes for children/youth who received PA3 services in CY 2014.

The cost evaluation results suggest that some counties are seeing greater cost efficiencies by reducing the amount of their fixed-rate contract expenditures. This is supported by some Core Services coordinators reporting that fee-for-service contracts appear to work better in managing expenditures. However, fixed-rate contracts appeal to coordinators from rural counties who use them as a means to maintain the sustainability of their providers due to the unpredictability of Core Services demand. This varying perspective is explained by the following quote: “The 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.”

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 are being considered to more efficiently collect, enter, and access data regarding service delivery, costs, and outcomes. In addition, counties will be engaged through ongoing training and consultation opportunities to make full use of the available data for quality improvement purposes. Finally, counties have been 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 2015

#### 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 2015

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 2015

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 2015
- The following service closure reasons were excluded because there is no service effectiveness outcome recorded in Trails: (1) Contract funds expended (only when system closed the service; include when caseworker selects); (2) Moved out of county; (3) Case transferred to another county; (4) Opened in error; (5) Change in funding source, and (6) Payee wrong code.

The PA3 program area type was further categorized into prevention and intervention based on the following criteria: Prevention group is for children/youth who had a screen-out referral or a closed assessment within 60 days prior to receiving PA3 services. The intervention group is for children/youth who had an open case within 60 days prior to receiving PA3 services.

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 2015 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 2014 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 2015.

- 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 2015.

- 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 2015 was divided by the total expenditures.
- The total of all clients who received a Core Service during CY 2015 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 2015

The Core Services County Designed Programs **bolded** are Evidenced Based Services to Adolescents Awards \$4,006,949 State Wide - Senate Bill 15-234 Family and Children's line, Footnote #34 (Long Bill)

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

County	Service Type on Core Plan	Existing Service Type in Trails to be Used
<b>Denver</b>	Functional Family Therapy	Functional Family Therapy
	Family Advocate Program	Supervised Visitation
	<b>Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST) (Ex)</b>	<b>Multi Systemic Therapy</b>
	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
<b>Dolores</b>	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
<b>Douglas</b>	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
<b>Eagle</b>	<b>Family Centered Meeting Coordination (Ex)</b>	<b>Family Group Decision Making</b>
	Mediation Services	Mediation Services
	Family Engagement Meetings	Family Engagement Meetings/Services
<b>Elbert</b>	<b>Multi-Systemic Therapy (Ex)</b>	<b>Multi Systemic Therapy</b>
	<b>Family Coaching/Youth Mentoring (Ex)</b>	<b>Family Strengths</b>
	Youth Mentoring	Mentoring
	<b>Parenting With Love and Limits (Ex)</b>	<b>Parenting Skills</b>
	Equine Therapy	Intensive Mentoring
<b>El Paso</b>	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
	<b>Functional Family Therapy (Ex)</b>	<b>Functional Family Therapy</b>
	<b>Multi-Systemic Therapy (Ex)</b>	<b>Multi Systemic Therapy</b>
	Reconnecting Youth/Vocational	Reconnecting Youth
	Team Decision Making	Team Decision Making (TDM)
Adolescent Mentoring	Mentoring	
<b>Fremont</b>	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Family Group Conferencing	Family Group Decision Making
	Adolescent Support Group	Adolescent Support Group
	<b>Functional Family Therapy (Ex)</b>	<b>Functional Family Therapy</b>
	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
<b>Garfield</b>	Adolescent Mediation (Ex)	Mediation
	Collaborative Family Services (CBFSS)	Community Based Family Services & Support (CBFSS)
<b>Gilpin</b>	None	
<b>Grand</b>	Parenting Time/Supervision	Supervised Visitation
	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Family to Family Team Decision Making	CET/TDM
<b>Gunnison/Hinsdale</b>	Therapeutic Mentoring (Ex)	Mentoring
<b>Huerfano</b>	Reconnecting Youth (Ex)	Reconnecting Youth
<b>Jackson</b>	Parent Focus Collaborative Family Services (CBFSS)	Community Based Family Services & Support (CBFSS)
	Child Mentoring/Family Support	Child Mentoring/Family Support
<b>Jefferson</b>	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
<b>Kiowa</b>	None	
<b>Kit Carson</b>	Functional Family Therapy (Ex)	Functional Family Therapy
<b>Lake</b>	High Fidelity Wraparound Program	Community Based Family Services & Support (CBFSS)
	Supervised Visitation	Supervised Visitation
<b>La Plata</b>	Play Therapy	Play Therapy
	Multi-Systemic Therapy (Ex)	Multi Systemic Therapy
	Ad. Dialectical Behavioral (Ex)	Youth Intervention Program
<b>Larimer</b>	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	
<b>Las Animas</b>	Family Partnership	Mentoring
	Trauma Informed Behavioral Health	Behavioral Health
	Family Advocate Program	Family Outreach
	None	
	Foster Adopt Parents Support Services	Foster Care/Adoption Support
<b>Logan</b>	Play Therapy	Play Therapy
	Parenting with Love and Limits	Parenting Skills
	Family Outreach Services	Family Outreach
<b>Mesa</b>	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
<b>Mesa (continued)</b>	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
<b>Moffat</b>	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Equine Therapy	Mentoring
<b>Montezuma</b>	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
<b>Montrose</b>	<b>Promoting Healthy Adolescents Trends (Ex)</b>	<b>Adolescent Support Group</b>
	Domestic Violence Intervention Services	Domestic Violence Intervention Services
	Mentoring	Mentoring
<b>Morgan</b>	Structured Parenting Time	Structured Parenting Time
	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Family Group Decision Making	Family Group Decision Making
	<b>Parenting With Love and Limits (Ex)</b>	<b>Parenting Skills</b>
<b>Otero</b>	Play Therapy	Play Therapy
<b>Ouray/ San Miguel</b>	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Parenting with Love and Logic Way	Parenting Skills
<b>Park</b>	Family Engagement/Empowerment/ Preservation	Family Empowerment
<b>Phillips</b>	None	
<b>Pitkin</b>	Supervised Visitation	Supervised Visitation
<b>Prowers</b>	None	
<b>Pueblo</b>	Visitation Center	Supervised Visitation
	<b>For Keeps Program (Ex)</b>	<b>Youth Outreach</b>
<b>Rio Blanco</b>	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
<b>Rio Grande/ Mineral</b>	Nurturing Parenting Program	Nurturing Parenting
<b>Routt</b>	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Supervised Visitation Safe Exchange Program	Supervised Visitation
<b>Saguache</b>	Nurturing Parenting	Nurturing Parenting
<b>San Juan</b>	Multi-Systemic Therapy	Multi Systemic Therapy
<b>Sedgwick</b>	None	
<b>Summit</b>	Play Therapy	Play Therapy
	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
	Community Infant and Child Program	Family Empowerment
	Therapeutic Supervised Visitation	Supervised Visitation
<b>Teller</b>	<b>Multi Systemic Therapy (Ex)</b>	<b>Multi Systemic Therapy</b>
	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
<b>Washington</b>	Nurturing Program	Nurturing Program
	Play Therapy	Play Therapy
	Behavior Specialist	Child/Family Services Therapist
<b>Weld</b>	<b>Functional Family Therapy (Ex)</b>	<b>Functional Family Therapy</b>
	<b>TIGHT (Ex)</b>	<b>Reconnecting Youth</b>
	<b>Multi-Systemic Therapy (Ex)</b>	<b>Multi Systemic Therapy</b>

County	Service Type on Core Plan	Existing Service Type in Trails to be Used
<b>Weld (continued)</b>	Foster Parent Consultation	Foster care/Adoption Support
	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
	Day Treatment Alternative	Day Treatment Alternative
<b>Yuma</b>	Mentoring to Adolescents	Mentoring
	Community Based Family Services	Community Based Family Services & Support (CBFSS)
<b>Southern Ute</b>	Multi-Systemic Therapy	Multi Systemic Therapy