Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

This report presents data collected by the Administrative Review Division (ARD) through the Out-of-Home Review process. The results are grouped by CFSR Outcome and Item.

There are several key components to fully understanding the report. First, any item which is Compliance related will have the question number displayed in **BOLD** font, while those that are Data oriented (i.e., collected in order to gather more systemic information) will be displayed in normal font.

Also, as the compliance level for achieving Substantial Conformity during the CFSR is now set at 95%, any item falling below this level will be highlighted by the following symbol:

After the end of each quarter, a new report containing the most recent quarter's data will be made available for all stakeholders on the Colorado Department of Human Services Portal.

First Quarter = July - September
Second Quarter = October - December
Third Quarter = January - March
Fourth Quarter = April - June

Report created on: 7/15/2013

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Safety Outcome 2

Item 4: Risk of Harm

Safety

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1709	If there were new allegations of abuse or neglect identified during the review period, were they entered as a referral into Trails?	71	1	126	98.6 %	38	0	110	100.0%	46	2	148	95.8%	29	1	97	96.7%
1712	If a new safety concern was identified regarding this child/youth, were the safety needs of the child/youth adequately addressed during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply)	60	4	134	93.8 %	37	1	110	97.4%	50	0	146	100.0%	29	0	98	100.0%
	No assessment/investigation		1				1				0				0		
	No respite care		1				0				0				0		
	No, other		3				1				0				0		

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placements

Case Planning/Services

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1729	At the time of the review, is the child/youth placed in the most appropriate setting to meet his/her individual needs? (Check all No responses that apply)	193	3	2	98.5 %	142	3	3	97.9%	194	0	2	100.0%	126	0	1	100.0%
	No, other		3				3				0				0		

Permanency

1753	If the child/youth experienced one or more moves during the review period, were all of the placement changes planned by the agency in an effort to achieve the child/youth's case goals or to meet the needs of the child/youth? (Check "Yes, in line with case goal + planned" if both Yes answers are appropriate)	31	30	137	50.8 %	15	20	113	42.9%	25	18	153	58.1%	26	20	81	56.5%
	Yes, in line with case goal and planned		23				13				18				22		
	Yes, to meet youth's specific needs and planned		8				2				7				4		
1754	If the child/youth experienced one or more moves during the review period that were not planned, what was/were the reason(s) for the move(s)? (Check all that apply)																
	Child on child abuse		1				0				0				0		
	More than one move		4				4				4				5		
	Other		2				2				1				1		
	Provider abuse or neglect allegations		3				2				0				1		
	Provider quit or closed		0				1				0				1		
	Provider request		18				9				13				13		
	Runaway		5				2				5				3		
	Temporary setting		6				6				7				5		
	Youth's behavior		9				6				6				4		

Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child

Permanency

1760	In the reviewer's opinion, is the primary court ordered permanency goal, at the time of the review, appropriate for this child/youth?	186	12	0	93.9 %	144	4	0	97.3%	191	2	3	99.0%	124	3	0	97.6%
1762	If a petition/motion to terminate parental rights has not been filed, and a compelling reason has been identified, in the reviewer's opinion, is the compelling reason appropriate?	7	1	190	87.5 %	1	1	146	50.0%	2	0	194	100.0%	0	0	127	
	No		1				0				0				0		
	No, not completed		0				1				0				0		

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 1

Permanency

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1755	At the time of the review, are reasonable efforts being made to achieve permanency? (Check all No responses that apply)	198	0	0	100.0 %	146	0	2	100.0%	195	1	0	99.5%	126	0	1	100.0%
	No reasonable efforts to return home		0				0				1				0		
1756	For a child/youth with a goal of return home, is progress being made toward achieving the goal? (Check all No responses that apply)	18	39	141	31.6 %	23	47	78	32.9%	22	44	130	33.3%	23	30	74	43.4%
	No housing		3				6				1				0		
	No, ICPC		1				2				0				1		
	No, child lack of progress		8				8				3				3		
	No, court delays		0				1				0				0		
	No, other		2				3				2				1		
	No, other potential caregiver lack of progress		1				0				0				0		
	No, parent incarc. or long term treatment program		6				0				0				0		
	No, parent lack of progress		35				40				41				27		
	No, parent(s)/guardian(s) services appropriateness		0				0				3				0		
	No, parents whereabouts are unknown		1				1				0				1		
1758	For a child/youth with a permanency goal of permanent placement with a relative/non-relative through legal guardianship/permanent custody, is progress being made toward the goal? (Check all No responses that apply)	6	6	186	50.0 %	0	2	146	0.0%	0	2	194	0.0%	1	0	126	100.0%
	No, ICPC		3				2				0				0		
	No, child lack of progress		1				0				0				0		
	No, lack of effort/inadequate supervision		1				0				0				0		
	No, other		1				0				1				0		
	No, other potential caregiver lack of progress		2				0				0				0		
	No, placement provider does not support perm. goal		0				0				1				0		

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 9: Adoption

Permanency

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1757	For a child/youth with a goal of adoption, is progress being made toward finalizing the adoption? (Check all No responses that apply)	28	45	125	38.4 %	20	29	99	40.8%	38	43	115	46.9%	27	29	71	48.2%
	No CARR listing		0				1				3				0		
	No adoptive home		19				19				26				13		
	No, ICPC		9				2				1				1		
	No, appeal of termination		23				7				12				10		
	No, child/youth declined		1				0				0				0		
	No, court delays		0				0				3				4		
	No, lack of provider support		0				0				1				0		
	No, other		3				7				1				5		
	No, placement provider does not support perm. goal		0				0				0				2		
	No, termination denied		1				0				0				0		

Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement

Case Planning/Services

1731	For all youth over age 16 years and 60 days, is there a comprehensive ILP that addresses all needs identified from a state-approved assessment? (Check all No responses that apply)	38	5	155	88.4 %	16	13	119	55.2%	30	13	153	69.8%	9	13	105	40.9%
	No description or plan of services		1				5				3				1		
	No plan		3				2				2				4		
	No self-sufficiency budget		0				10				5				6		
	No state approved assessment used		2				4				6				5		
	No, all identified needs not addressed		0				1				0				0		
	No, not timely		0				1				0				0		
	No, not updated		0				0				2				1		
	Not all ILP tabs completed		1				3				3				1		
	Not developed with youth		0				1				0				1		
1733	For all youth over age 16 years and 60 days, is the youth receiving services to address all the needs identified in the comprehensive assessment and the FSP 4D? (Check all that apply)	39	4	155	90.7 %	22	4	122	84.6%	36	6	154	85.7%	21	1	105	95.5%
	No referral for Chafee services		1				2				2				0		
	No, provider issues		0				0				1				0		
	No, youth refused services		2				0				2				0		

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement

Case Planning/Services

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1735	Is there a comprehensive, youth-driven Emancipation Transition Plan (ETP) developed 90 business days before the youth's projected permanency date? (Check all No responses that apply) (Check only "No plan" if there is not ETP plan)	5	0	193	100.0 %	4	0	144	100.0%	0	2	194	0.0%	0	0	127	
	No plan		0				0				2				0		
1736	Per Volume 7, have all vital documents been obtained for youth with an OPPLA goal 90 business days before their projected permanency date? (Check all No responses that apply)	6	0	192	100.0 %	3	0	145	100.0%	1	1	194	50.0%	0	0	127	
	No State ID/driver's license		0				0				1				0		
	No educational records		0				0				1				0		

Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement

Permanency

1759	For a child/youth a permanency goal of Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement, is it documented that all other more permanent goals have been considered and appropriately ruled out? (Check all No responses that apply)	58	0	140	100.0 %	23	0	122	100.0%	31	2	149	93.9%	11	2	110	84.6%
	No documentation		0				0				1				1		
	No, child/youth is under 16 years of age		0				3				14				4		
	No, documented reasons not appropriate		0				0				0				1		
	No, not reviewed annually		0				0				1				1		

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 2

Item 11: Proximity of Placement

Case Planning/Services

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1726	Is the child/youth placed within close proximity to his/her parents or other potential permanent caregiver's home?	70	8	120	89.7 %	86	0	62	100.0%	107	3	86	97.3%	90	2	35	97.8%
1727	If a child/youth is not placed in close proximity to his/her parents or other potential permanent caregiver's home, were reasonable efforts made to support or facilitate face-to-face contact with the parents or potential permanent caregivers?	9	0	189	100.0 %	1	0	147	100.0%	3	0	193	100.0%	2	0	125	100.0%

Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

Permanency

1773	Does the frequency of visitation with the mother/guardian/kin adequately address the needs of the child/youth to maintain or promote continuity of the relationship? (Check all No responses that apply)	53	25	120	67.9 %	58	15	75	79.5%	59	25	112	70.2%	50	5	72	90.9%
	No, OOH Provider		1				0				0				0		
	No, child/youth		1				1				0				0		
	No, court		1				1				0				0		
	No, mother/guardian/kin		24				14				24				5		
	No, other		0				0				1				0		
1774	Does the frequency of visitation with the father/guardian/kin adequately address the needs of the child/youth to maintain or promote continuity of the relationship? (Check all No responses that apply)	26	18	154	59.1 %	23	8	117	74.2%	26	20	150	56.5%	29	3	95	90.6%
	No, OOH Provider		1				0				0				0		
	No, child/youth		0				2				1				1		
	No, county		0				0				1				0		
	No, court		2				0				1				0		
	No, father/guardian/kin		16				6				20				3		
	No, other		0				0				1				0		
1775	Does the frequency of visitation with the sibling(s) adequately address the needs of the child/youth to maintain or promote continuity of the relationship(s)? (Check all No responses that apply)	70	6	122	92.1 %	68	5	75	93.2%	67	12	117	84.8%	59	3	65	95.2%
	No, OOH Provider		0				1				5				2		
	No, child/youth		0				0				1				0		
	No, county		4				3				2				0		
	No, other		1				0				0				0		
	No, parent/guardian/kin		1				1				2				0		
	No, sibling		0				0				2				1		

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 2

Item 14: Preserving Connections

Court

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1705	Were these ICWA requirements met? (Check all that apply)	23	21	154	52.3 %	15	18	115	45.5%	12	27	157	30.8%	2	8	117	20.0%
	No court order determ. if ICWA does NOT apply		0				2				7				4		
	No docum. of inquiry of Native American heritage		14				8				9				0		
	No notification sent to all identified tribes/BIA		4				5				7				3		
	No response from tribe/BIA		5				3				10				4		
	No, new info obtained during FF portion of review		0				2				1				0		
	No, other		0				1				0				0		
	No, tribe not notified of hearings		0				0				0				1		

Case Planning/Services

1728	Is the department making concerted efforts to maintain the child/youth's connections during the review period?	192	4	2	98.0 %	147	0	1	100.0%	193	0	3	100.0%	126	0	1	100.0%

Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents

Permanency

1777	Did the agency promote and support a positive and nurturing relationship between the child/youth and his/her parents? (Check all that apply)	65	12	121	84.4 %	53	5	90	91.4%	62	21	113	74.7%	55	5	67	91.7%
	Yes, encouraged attend. at doctors' appointments		5				7				10				4		
	Yes, encouraged foster parents to become mentors		5				1				5				2		
	Yes, facil. contact w/parents not in close proxim.		4				4				3				1		
	Yes, facilitated contact w/incarcerated parents		3				0				2				0		
	Yes, other		0				0				1				1		
	Yes, provid. therap. situations to strengthen rel.		57				47				56				50		
	Yes, provided transportation/funds		12				12				10				15		

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 17: Needs/Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents

Case Planning/Services

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1721	Does the Family Services Plan treatment plan document services that are directed at the areas of need identified through assessment?	163	35	0	82.3 %	110	38	0	74.3%	151	45	0	77.0%	95	32	0	74.8%
	No		23				32				34				25		
	No treatment plan developed		2				0				7				0		
	No, all task time frames expired		10				6				4				7		
1722	Were all required parties addressed in the treatment plan? (Check all No responses that apply)	154	44	0	77.8 %	119	29	0	80.4%	156	40	0	79.6%	89	38	0	70.1%
	No treatment plan developed		2				0				7				0		
	No, all task time frames expired		10				7				4				7		
	No, child/youth		1				1				4				8		
	No, county		8				2				0				0		
	No, father/guardian		1				2				2				5		
	No, mother/guardian		1				0				0				0		
	No, other		0				0				0				1		
	No, out of home provider		12				19				17				20		
	No, some task time frames expired		13				2				11				8		
1723	Does the Family Services Plan treatment plan include objectives and action steps that document clear expectations in order to achieve the permanency goal? (Check all No responses that apply)	158	40	0	79.8 %	127	21	0	85.8%	160	36	0	81.6%	92	35	0	72.4%
	No treatment plan developed		2				0				7				0		
	No, all task time frames expired		10				7				4				7		
	No, measurable		20				7				24				27		
	No, realistic		0				0				0				2		
	No, specific		18				8				5				16		

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 17: Needs/Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents

Case Planning/Services

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1724	Does the most recent 90-day review/Court report in Trails meet Volume 7 requirements? (Check all No responses that apply)	156	42	0	78.8 %	109	39	0	73.6%	140	56	0	71.4%	89	38	0	70.1%
	No approval		3				12				7				10		
	No current 90-day review		3				4				8				3		
	No diligent search		26				27				34				21		
	No, barriers to progress		5				2				1				3		
	No, child/youth services and progress		3				6				4				5		
	No, child/youth services appropriateness		0				1				0				4		
	No, child/youth's safety		0				0				0				4		
	No, need for add./diff. svcs. and how provided		0				0				0				3		
	No, parent services and progress		0				1				0				1		
	No, permanency goal		4				1				1				4		
	No, permanency goal date		5				2				5				5		
	No, task time frames		9				5				9				12		
	No, timely provision of mandated services		0				0				0				3		

Health

1749	If the goal is/was return home during the review period and substance abuse issues have been identified for the parent(s)/guardian(s), what are the substances of use? (Check all that apply)																
	Alcohol		15				22				14				15		
	CNS Depressants		2				0				6				0		
	CNS Stimulants		1				2				0				0		
	Cocaine/Crack		13				11				16				4		
	Heroin		4				0				7				0		
	Marijuana		16				10				17				9		
	Methamphetamine		17				8				25				11		
	Other		0				3				4				5		
	Other Opiates		6				1				10				3		

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 1

Health

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1750	If the goal is/was return home during the review period and substance abuse issues have been identified for the parent(s)/guardian(s), were substance abuse treatment services provided to the parent(s)/guardian(s)? (Check all No responses that apply)	20	13	165	60.6 %	20	12	116	62.5%	13	30	153	30.2%	19	6	102	76.0%
	No, delays of 2 + weeks		0				0				7				0		
	No, parent/guardian refused services		13				11				27				5		
	Unable to determine - outside services		0				1				0				1		
1751	If substance abuse issues have been identified during the review period for the child/youth, what are the substances of use? (Check all that apply)																
	Alcohol		5				3				3				6		
	CNS Depressants		0				0				0				1		
	Cocaine/Crack		0				1				0				0		
	Heroin		0				0				1				0		
	Marijuana		11				7				9				6		
	Methamphetamine		4				3				3				1		
	Other		0				1				0				0		
1752	If substances abuse issues have been identified during the review period for the child/youth, were substance abuse treatment services provided to the child/youth? (Check all No responses that apply)	9	2	187	81.8 %	7	3	138	70.0%	8	1	187	88.9%	5	1	121	83.3%
	No referral by county		1				1				0				0		
	No, child/youth refused services		1				2				1				1		
	No, delays of 2 + weeks		1				0				0				0		
	Unable to determine - outside services		0				1				0				0		

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 18: Child/Family Involvement in Case Planning

Case Planning/Services

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1713	Was the out-of-home provider engaged in case planning, during the review period? (Check all responses that apply)	192	3	3	98.5 %	144	0	4	100.0%	192	0	4	100.0%	124	2	1	98.4%
	No		3				0				0				2		
1715	Was the child/youth engaged in case planning, during the review period?	82	1	115	98.8 %	76	0	72	100.0%	68	1	127	98.6%	51	0	76	100.0%
	No, efforts made but refused		1				0				1				0		
1717	Was the mother/guardian/kin engaged in case planning, during the review period?	77	9	112	89.5 %	75	1	72	98.7%	79	7	110	91.9%	55	1	71	98.2%
	No		7				0				4				0		
	No, efforts made but refused		2				1				3				1		
1719	Was the father/guardian/kin engaged in case planning during the review period?	51	12	135	81.0 %	33	2	113	94.3%	40	17	139	70.2%	32	5	90	86.5%
	No		9				2				10				1		
	No, efforts made but refused		3				0				7				4		

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

Permanency

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1763	How many months should the assigned worker have made face-to-face contact with the child/youth during the review period? (Answer for in-state cases only)																
	1		0				1				3				0		
	2		0				2				0				0		
	3		3				2				4				3		
	4		2				5				2				1		
	5		43				54				54				33		
	6		138				76				108				75		
	7		3				0				18				6		
1764	How many months did the assigned worker make face-to-face contact with the child/youth during the review period? (Within the state of Colorado, not an ICPC case)																
	1		0				1				3				0		
	2		2				2				0				0		
	3		3				2				10				5		
	4		8				15				8				12		
	5		46				58				58				35		
	6		127				62				95				60		
	7		3				0				15				6		
	Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child?				97.9%				96.8%				96.5%				%95.5
	In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?	171	18		90.5%	120	20		85.7%	162	27		85.7%	94	24		79.7%

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

Permanency

1765 How many months should the worker of either the sending or receiving state make face-to-face contact with the child/youth, placed outside the state, during the review period? (Answer for ICPC cases only)

	1st Quarter SFY 2013	2nd Quarter SFY 2013	3rd Quarter SFY 2013	4th Quarter SFY 2013
1	0	0	0	1
2	1	1	0	0
3	1	0	4	3
4	0	1	0	0
5	1	0	4	0
6	7	6	2	8
7	0	0	3	0

1766 How many months did the worker of either the sending or receiving state make face-to-face contact with the child/youth during the review period, for a child/youth placed outside the state? (Answer for ICPC cases only)

	1st Quarter SFY 2013	2nd Quarter SFY 2013	3rd Quarter SFY 2013	4th Quarter SFY 2013
1	0	0	0	3
2	3	1	0	0
3	2	3	6	3
4	1	3	1	3
5	3	0	3	0
6	1	1	3	3

Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child? %72.4

	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?	0	0		.0%	0	0		.0%	0	0		.0%	7	5		58.3%
1767 Did the frequency of contact with the child/youth in his/her place of residence occur according to Volume 7?	187	10	1	94.9 %	127	18	3	87.6%	188	8	0	95.9%	118	8	1	93.7%

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

Permanency

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1768	Was the quality of contacts with the child/youth sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child/youth and to promote achievement of case goals? (Check all No responses that apply)	144	54	0	72.7 %	103	42	3	71.0%	145	51	0	74.0%	80	46	1	63.5%
	No		30				14				15				11		
	No assessment of safety		37				27				38				39		
	No, outside presence of provider		37				36				30				35		

Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents

Permanency

1769	Did the frequency of contact with the mother/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	31	25	142	55.4 %	42	18	88	70.0%	36	28	132	56.3%	37	14	76	72.5%
1770	Was the quality of contacts with the mother/guardian/kin sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child/youth and to promote achievement of case goals?	38	13	147	74.5 %	52	8	88	86.7%	43	21	132	67.2%	44	7	76	86.3%
1771	Did the frequency of contact with the father/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	13	19	166	40.6 %	19	7	122	73.1%	22	4	170	84.6%	12	7	108	63.2%
1772	Was the quality of contacts with the father/guardian/kin sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child/youth and to promote achievement of case goals?	21	6	171	77.8 %	22	4	122	84.6%	21	5	170	80.8%	11	8	108	57.9%

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 2

Item 21: Educational Needs of Child

Education

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1737	Is the child/youth's education/school record in the case file? (Check all No responses that apply)	102	30	66	77.3 %	72	33	43	68.6%	102	28	66	78.5%	73	22	32	76.8%
	No GED/Diploma		1				1				0				0		
	No address of current school		2				5				2				4		
	No credit count		0				3				0				0		
	No current IEP		10				11				11				8		
	No current grade reports		22				21				18				10		
	No name of current school		1				0				0				0		
1738	For children aged 3 - 5: Is the child enrolled in Head Start or another early childhood education program?	32	3	163	91.4 %	12	3	133	80.0%	22	7	167	75.9%	18	3	106	85.7%
	Information not available		0				1				0				1		
	Yes, assessed only		6				2				2				1		
	Yes, enrolled		26				10				20				17		
1739	For youth aged 16 or older: Is the youth on track to graduate and/or complete high school?	35	9	154	79.5 %	21	11	116	65.6%	33	9	154	78.6%	17	8	102	68.0%
	GED		1				0				0				1		
	Graduated		3				4				3				1		
	Information not available		0				3				2				5		
	No GED		2				2				0				0		
	No, graduate		7				6				7				3		
1740	Was educational stability provided for the child during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply)	90	40	68	69.2 %	58	46	44	55.8%	91	43	62	67.9%	60	33	34	64.5%
	No, changed schools during review period		27				24				24				26		
	No, delays in enrollment		1				0				0				0		
	No, initial placement required change in school		17				22				21				13		
	No, req. 504 or IEP spec. ed. svcs. were not prov.		0				2				0				0		
	No, schl. distr. refused to provide appropr. svcs.		0				0				0				1		
1741	Were the child/youth's educational needs assessed?	157	3	38	98.1 %	117	0	31	100.0%	145	0	51	100.0%	104	0	23	100.0%

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 3

Item 22: Physical Health of Child Health

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1742	Is health information in the case file, including name and address of current health care provider(s), known medical problems and current medications? (Check all No responses that apply)	195	3	0	98.5 %	142	4	2	97.3%	192	2	2	99.0%	125	1	1	99.2%
	No provider address/phone number		3				4				2				1		
	No provider name		1				2				2				1		
1743	Did the child/youth receive a medical exam, medical screening, or was a medical exam scheduled within two weeks of initial placement? (Check all No responses that apply) (Initial Review Only)	29	7	162	80.6 %	44	11	93	80.0%	38	15	143	71.7%	22	3	102	88.0%
	No, Medicaid card		1				0				0				0		
	No, late		6				8				6				3		
	No, never occurred		0				2				6				1		
	No, other		0				2				3				0		
	Yes, appointment		4				7				8				3		
	Yes, exam		25				37				30				19		
1744	Did the child/youth receive a full dental examination or was a dental exam scheduled within eight weeks of initial placement? (Check all No responses that apply) (Initial Review Only)	26	3	169	89.7 %	36	7	105	83.7%	33	5	158	86.8%	17	3	107	85.0%
	No, late		2				4				1				2		
	No, never occurred		1				3				4				2		
	No, other		1				0				0				0		
	Yes, appointment		0				2				0				1		
	Yes, exam		26				34				33				16		

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 3

Item 22: Physical Health of Child

Health

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1745	Has the child/youth received regular health care, including immunizations, and/or treatment for identified health needs? (Services delivered) (Check all No responses that apply)	144	54	0	72.7 %	97	49	2	66.4%	153	41	2	78.9%	91	35	1	72.2%
	No statement from medical examiner		31				32				29				22		
	No treatment for identified needs		4				1				0				0		
	No, Medicaid		0				0				0				1		
	No, immunizations		9				22				4				10		
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through		28				11				17				18		
	No, other		0				1				6				0		
1746	Has the child/youth received regular dental care and treatment for identified dental needs? (Services delivered) (Check all No responses that apply)	133	33	32	80.1 %	95	26	27	78.5%	135	26	35	83.9%	74	37	16	66.7%
	No treatment for identified needs		0				1				0				0		
	No, Medicaid		2				0				4				1		
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through		32				23				24				36		
	No, other		1				2				5				2		

Item 23: Mental Health of Child

Health

1747	Were the child/youth's mental health needs assessed?	163	2	33	98.8 %	122	1	25	99.2%	152	0	44	100.0%	110	0	17	100.0%
1748	Were mental health services provided to meet the child/youth's needs during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply)	91	54	53	62.8 %	73	43	32	62.9%	94	43	59	68.6%	64	36	27	64.0%
	No available services		1				0				1				4		
	No sufficient services		3				2				0				3		
	No, Medicaid		0				1				0				0		
	No, OOH provider issue		1				1				1				2		
	No, changed MH provider		30				19				24				18		
	No, child refused services		2				9				0				2		
	No, delays of 2 + weeks		23				18				21				16		
	No, mental health systems issue		2				8				16				3		
	No, other		1				3				4				5		

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Systemic Factors

Item 25: Process to Ensure Each Child Has a Written Case Plan Developed Jointly with Parents

Case Planning/Services

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1730	Does the FSP 4 B/C contain a comprehensive description of the type and appropriateness of the homes or facilities in which the child/youth was placed during the review period?	155	43	0	78.3 %	107	39	2	73.3%	159	35	2	82.0%	102	24	1	81.0%

Item 27: Permanency Hearing Every Twelve Months

Court

1703	If a child has been in care for 12 months or longer, is there a court order in the case file that was signed and dated within the last 12 months that contains reasonable efforts to achieve permanency language, and does not contain "nunc pro tunc" language? (Re-Review Only)	151	9	38	94.4 %	92	1	55	98.9%	135	1	60	99.3%	96	0	31	100.0%
	No signed court order		8				1				1				0		
	No, contains "nunc pro tunc" language		1				0				0				0		

Item 29: Process for Foster Parents, Pre-adoptive Parents, and Relative Caregivers to be Notified of, and an Opportunity to be Heard, in Any Review or Hearing Held with Respect to the Child

Due Process

1708	Were all required parties invited to the review and given at least two weeks notice? (Check all that apply)	181	17	0	91.4 %	130	18	0	87.8%	181	15	0	92.3%	111	16	0	87.4%
	No, GAL		0				2				4				2		
	No, OOH Provider		10				4				6				6		
	No, Tribe/BIA (if ICWA applies)		2				2				1				2		
	No, child over 12		1				3				0				3		
	No, father/guardian		2				6				4				3		
	No, mother/guardian		2				0				0				1		
	No, not timely		0				1				0				0		

Adams

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Miscellaneous

Miscellaneous

Court

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1701	Is this a court ordered review?	3	195	0	1.5 %	2	146	0	1.4%	1	195	0	0.5%	1	126	0	0.8%
1702	Is there a signed removal order that contains best interest or welfare of the child language, and determines if reasonable efforts were made or an emergency justified lack of reasonable efforts, and does not contain "nunc pro tunc" language? (Check all that apply) (Initial Review Only)	38	0	160	100.0 %	54	0	94	100.0%	54	1	141	98.2%	25	0	102	100.0%
	No signed removal order		0				0				1				0		
1704	Has the county had authority for placement within the review period? (A Fiscal Sanction may result if the answer is "No.")	198	0	0	100.0 %	148	0	0	100.0%	195	1	0	99.5%	126	1	0	99.2%

IV-E

1706	Has IV-E eligibility been determined within 45 days of removal? (A Fiscal Sanction may result if the answer is "No.") (Initial Review Only)	36	0	162	100.0 %	54	0	94	100.0%	54	0	142	100.0%	25	0	102	100.0%
1707	Has a timely IV-E redetermination been completed during the review period? (Re-Review Only)	58	0	140	100.0 %	31	0	117	100.0%	50	0	146	100.0%	35	0	92	100.0%

Permanency

1778	Were the previous compliance issues addressed? (Re-Review Only)	75	37	86	67.0 %	37	30	81	55.2%	61	47	88	56.5%	44	41	42	51.8%

Credit Report

1779	If the youth is 16 years and older have the youth and the GAL received a copy of all consumer credit reports annually?	0	0	0		0	0	79		0	0	195		0	0	127	
	No, requested but not received - Experian		0				0				1				0		
1780	If the youth is 16 years and older and has a credit report with evidence of inaccuracies, has the county department or the GAL referred the youth to an approved agency to resolve the inaccuracies?	0	0	0		0	0	79		0	0	196		0	0	127	
1781	If the youth is 16 years and older and has a credit report with evidence of inaccuracies, is the county department making efforts to resolve the inaccuracies, or have the inaccuracies been addressed?	0	0	0		0	0	79		0	0	196		0	0	127	