## 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

### **Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews**

**Administrative Review Division** 

		<u>1st Q</u>	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 20	<u>013</u>	<u>2nd</u>	Quarte	r SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	<u>3rd (</u>	<u>Quarte</u>	r SFY	<u> 2013</u>	<u>4th</u>	Quarte	r SFY	<u>2013</u>
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Safety O	utcome 2																
	Risk of Harm																
Sa	ıfety																
1709	If there were new allegations of abuse or neglect identified during the review period, were they entered as a referral into Trails?	6	3	19	66.7 % 🔥	19	0	25 1	100.0%	8	0	28	100.0%	20	1	25	95.2%
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	7	3	18	70.0 % Å	24	2	18	92.3% 🗘	7	0	29	100.0%	14	0	32	100.0%
	period? (Check all No responses that apply)  No Safety Plan			3			0				0				0		
	No assessment/investigation			U			2				U				U		

# Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

		1st Qu	arter	SFY 20	<u>)13</u>		2nd C	<u>luarter</u>	SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	<u>3</u>	rd Q	uarte	r SFY	<u> 2013</u>	<u>41</u>	h Qu	arter	SFY 201	<u>13</u>
		Yes	No	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>		Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Ye	s	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Ye	s I	No	NA 9	<u>%</u>
Dormono	ency Outcome 1				<u>,,,</u>			<u></u>		<u></u>		<u> </u>			<u>,,,</u>		_ :			<u> </u>
_	<u> </u>																			
	Stability of Foster Care Placements																			
	se Planning/Services		1			_								1						
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)	28	0	0	100.0 %		44	0	0[	100.0%		36	0	<u> </u>	100.0%	2	16	0	0 100	0.0%
Pe	ermanency																			
1753	If the child/youth experienced one or more moves during the review period,	2	6	20	25.0 %	Δ	8	8	28	50.0%	Δ	3	5	28	37.5%	<u> </u>	7	3	36 70	0.0% 🔥
	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)																			
	Yes, in line with case goal and planned		(	)				6					1					5		
	Yes, to meet youth's specific needs and planned			2				2					2					2		
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)																	•		
	More than one move		4	4				3					3					0		
	Other		(	)				3					1					0		
	Provider abuse or neglect allegations		2	2				2					0					1		
	Provider quit or closed Provider request		·	  -				1					1					2		
	Runaway			) 1				2					ა ე					0		
	Temporary setting			I 4				4					3					1		
	Youth's behavior		,	<del>*</del> 2				4					2					1		
Item 7:	Permanency Goal for Child		4	_				'					_					•		
	ermanency																			
1760	In the reviewer's opinion, is the primary court ordered permanency goal, at	26	2	0	92.9 %		42	2	0	95.5%		30	5	1	85.7%	4	15	1	0 97	'.8%
	the time of the review, appropriate for this child/youth?					<u> </u>				337373	<u> </u>			-	1				- 1	
1762	If a petition/motion to terminate parental rights has not been filed, and a	0	0	28	0.0 %		1	2	41	33.3%	Δ	3	0	33	100.0%		0	2	44 C	0.0% 🔥
	compelling reason has been identified, in the reviewer's opinion, is the	•		<u>-</u>			ı					•						н		
	compelling reason appropriate?			•				•					^					2		
	No, not completed		(	)				2					0					2		

## Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

**Administrative Review Division** 

		1st Q	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 20	<u>013</u>	2nd 0	Quarter	SFY 2	013	<u>3rd</u>	Quarte	r SFY	<u> 2013</u>	4th (	Quarter	SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>
Permane	ency Outcome 1	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Pe 1755	At the time of the review, are reasonable efforts being made to achieve permanency? (Check all No responses that apply)	28	0	0	100.0 %	44	0	0 1	00.0%	36	0	0	100.0%	46	0	0 1	100.0%
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)  No housing  No, ICPC  No, caseload/turnover  No, child lack of progress  No, court delays  No, other  No, parent incarc. or long term treatment program  No, parents whereabouts are unknown	2	9	17 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	18.2 %	12	3 0 0 4 2 1 2	17	44.4%	8	12 2 0 2 2 1 1 0 11	16	40.0%	6	17 1 1 0 2 0 0 0 15 1	23	26.1%
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)  No, ICPC  No, other potential caregiver lack of progress No, parent lack of progress No, placement provider does not support perm. goal	1	1	26 0 0 1	50.0 %	2	0 0 0 0 0	42 1	00.0%	1	0 0 0 0	35	100.0%	1	1 1 1 0	42	25.0%

### **Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews**

**Administrative Review Division** 

		1st Q	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 20	<u>)13</u>	<u>21</u>	nd Qı	uarter	SFY 2	<u>013</u>	3rd	<u>Quarte</u>	r SFY	<u> 2013</u>	<u>4t</u>	h Qu	ıarter	SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Y</u> e	<u>es</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Permane	ency Outcome 1																		
7	Adoption																		
	ermanency																		
1757	For a child/youth with a goal of adoption, is progress being made toward finalizing the adoption? (Check all No responses that apply)	3	7	18	30.0 %		1	8	35	11.1%	7	3	26	70.0%		8	4	34	66.7%
	No CARR listing			1				0				0					0		
	No adoptive home			4				3				3					1		
	No, ICPC			0				0				0					1		
	No, appeal of termination		;	3				1				0					0		
	No, court delays			0				0				0					2		
	No, lack of timely filing of TPR			0				3				0					0		
	No, other			3				4				0					2		
	No, subsidy issues			0				1				0					1		
	: Other Planned Living Arrangement																		
	ase Planning/Services														_			<u>.</u>	
1731	For all youth over age 16 years and 60 days, is there a comprehensive ILP	5	3	20	62.5 % 👲	7	3	5	36	37.5% 🧘	<u>\</u> 4	3	29	57.1%	⚠	4	4	38	50.0% 🔥
	that addresses all needs identified from a state-approved assessment?				_														
	(Check all No responses that apply)			_								•					_		
	No description or plan of services			1				4				0					2		
	No plan			0				0				1					0		
	No self-sufficiency budget		;	3				3				1					2		
	No state approved assessment used		;	3				1				1					2		
	No, not updated			0				1				1					0		
	Not all ILP tabs completed			0				2		_		1					3		
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)	7	1	20	87.5 % 🧘	<u> </u>	8	0	36 1	00.0%	6	0	30	100.0%		8	0	38 1	00.0%
	No, lack of resources			1				0				0					0		

#### **Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews**

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013 2nd					2nd Q	uarter	SFY 2	<u>013</u>		3rd (	Quarte	r SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	4th	Quarte	r SFY	<u> 2013</u>
		Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	_	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Permaner	ncy Outcome 1																		
	Other Planned Living Arrangement se Planning/Services																		
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)	0	0	28	0.0 %		0	0	44			1	2	33	33.3% 🚹	0	0	46	
	No, not all tabs completed			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)	0	0	28	0.0 %		0	0	44			3	0	33	100.0%	0	0	46	
	Other Planned Living Arrangement																		
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)	5	0	23	100.0 %		3	3	38	50.0%	<u> </u>	4	1	30	80.0%	4	1	40	80.0% 🔥
	No documentation			0				1					0				0		
	No, child/youth is under 16 years of age No, documented reasons not appropriate			0				0					1				1 1		
	No, not reviewed annually No, other			0 0 0				2 1					1 0				0		

# Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

		<u>1st Q</u>	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 20	<u>)13</u>	2nd (	Quarte	r SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	3rd	Quarte	r SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	4th C	Quarte	SFY	<u> 2013</u>
		Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Permane	ency Outcome 2																
	: Proximity of Placement use Planning/Services																
1726	Is the child/youth placed within close proximity to his/her parents or other potential permanent caregiver's home?	15	3	10	83.3 % 🚹	35	1	8	97.2%	27	2	7	93.1%	31	2	13	93.9% 🔥
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?	2	1	25	66.7 % Å	1	0	43 1	100.0%	2	0	34	100.0%	2	0	44	100.0%
	: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care																
	rmanency					-											
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)	14	6	8	70.0 % 🚹	33	7	4	82.5%	16	6	14	72.7%	24	11	11	68.6%
	No, child/youth			0			1				0				1		
	No, court			0			0				1				0		
	No, mother/guardian/kin			6			6				6				10		
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)	8	4	16	66.7 % 🔥	16	2	26	88.9% 4	10	4	22	71.4%	16	7	23	69.6% 🔥
	No, child/youth			0			0				1				2		
	No, court			0			0				1				0		
	No, father/guardian/kin			4			2				3				6		
	No, other			3			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)	11	0	17	100.0 %	14	1	29	93.3%	21	2	13	91.3%	14	3	29	82.4%
	No, child/youth			0			1				0				2		
	No, county			0			0				2				0		
	No, parent/guardian/kin			0			0				0				1		
	No, sibling			0			1				0				1		

#### **Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews**

Administrative Review Division

		1st Q	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 20	<u>)13</u>	2nd (	Quarte	SFY 2	013	3rd (	Quarter	SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	4th C	Quarte	r SFY	<u> 2013</u>
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Permane	ency Outcome 2																
Item 14	: Preserving Connections																
Co	purt																
1705	Were these ICWA requirements met? (Check all that apply)	5	2	21	71.4 % 🔥	4	9	31	30.8%	1	3	32	25.0% 🔥	5	9	32	35.7% 🔥
	No docum. of inquiry of Native American heritage			0		<u> </u>	4	<u> </u>			1			<u> </u>	0		
	No notification sent to all identified tribes/BIA			0			4				2				3		
	No response from tribe/BIA			2			3				0				6		
	No, new info obtained during FF portion of review			0			1				0				0		
Ca	se Planning/Services						-										
1728	Is the department making concerted efforts to maintain the child/youth's	28	0	0	100.0 %	44	0	0 1	00.0%	34	2	0	94.4% 🔥	46	0	0	00.0%
	connections during the review period?		·					<u> </u>	00.070	٠.			<u> </u>				
<u>Item 16</u>	: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents																
Pe	rmanency																
1777	Did the agency promote and support a positive and nurturing relationship between the child/youth and his/her parents? (Check all that apply)	19	0	9	100.0 %	40	0	4 1	00.0%	21	2	13	91.3%	35	1	10	97.2%
	Yes, encouraged attend. at doctors' appointments			6			12				2				12		
	Yes, encouraged attend. at extra-curricular activ.			3			1				1				6		
	Yes, encouraged foster parents to become mentors			4			9				4				5		
	Yes, facil. contact w/parents not in close proxim.			3			5				2				5		
	Yes, facilitated contact w/incarcerated parents			1			0				1				0		
	Yes, other			0			1				1				0		
	Yes, provid. therap. situations to strengthen rel.		1	8			32				15				23		
	Yes, provided transportation/funds			5			9				6				11		

## **Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews**

**Administrative Review Division** 

		<u>1st Q</u>	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 20	<u>)13</u>	2nd 0	Quarter	SFY 2	<u>013</u>	3rd	Quarte	r SFY	<u>2013</u>	4th C	Quarte	SFY	<u> 2013</u>
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Well Bei	ng Outcome 1																
	: Needs/Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents																
Ca	se Planning/Services																
1721	Does the Family Services Plan treatment plan document services that are	23	5	0	82.1 % 🔥	43	1	0	97.7%	32	4	0	88.9% 🗘	44	2	0	95.7%
	directed at the areas of need identified through assessment?																
	No			5			1				3				2		
	No, all task time frames expired			0			0			. ——	1				0		
1722	Were all required parties addressed in the treatment plan? (Check all No	25	3	0	89.3 % 🗘	38	6	0	86.4%	<u>\</u> 31	5	0	86.1% 🔥	43	3	0	93.5% 🔥
	responses that apply)  No, all task time frames expired			0			0				1				0		
	No, child/youth			0			2				0				1		
	No, county			2			3 1				0				1		
	No, father/guardian			2 0			0				1				0		
	No, out of home provider			ง ว			1				3				1		
	No, some task time frames expired			1			3				0				2		
1723	Does the Family Services Plan treatment plan include objectives and	26	2		92.9 % 🔥	37	7	0	84.1%	33	3	0	91.7%	41	5	0	89.1%
	action steps that document clear expectations in order to achieve the	20		0	32.3 70 <u></u>	07		<u> </u>	04.170	3 00			7 31.7 70 4	71	٥	<u> </u>	00:170
	permanency goal? (Check all No responses that apply)																
	No, all task time frames expired			0			0				1				0		
	No, measurable			2			7				2				5		
	No, specific			0			2				0				2		

## **Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews**

**Administrative Review Division** 

		<u>1st Q</u>	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 20	<u>)13</u>	<u>2nd (</u>	Quarte	r SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	3rd	Quarte	r SFY	<u> 2013</u>	4th	Quarte	er SFY	2013
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Well Bei	ing Outcome 1				_	·			<del></del>				_				_
Item 17	: Needs/Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents																
	ase Planning/Services																
1724	Does the most recent 90-day review/Court report in Trails meet Volume 7 requirements? (Check all No responses that apply)  No approval	26	2	0	92.9 % Å	34	10 1	0	77.3% 🚹	28	0	0	77.8% 🚹	40	6 1	0	87.0%
	No current 90-day review			1			1				0				0		
	No diligent search			0			7				8				2		
	No, parent services and progress			0			1				0				0		
	No, permanency goal			0			0				0				1		
	No, permanency goal date			0			1				0				3		
	No, task time frames			0			0				0				3		
<b>H</b> o 1749	lf 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			7			13				6				9		
	CNS Depressants			2			4				1				2		
	CNS Stimulants			0			0				0				6		
	Cocaine/Crack			1			2				3				3		
	Heroin			1			0				2				0		
	Marijuana			1			3				6				7		
	Methamphetamine			4			4				8				6		
	Other			0			2				0				2		
	Other Opiates			2			0				2				5		

## **Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews**

**Administrative Review Division** 

		1st Qu	<u>ıarter (</u>	SFY 20	<u>13</u>	<u>2r</u>	nd Qı	uarter	SFY 2	<u>013</u>	3	rd Qı	ıarter	SFY 2	<u>013</u>	<u>4th (</u>	Quarter	SFY 2	<u>013</u>
		Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Υe	<u>es</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Ye	<u>:S</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Well Bein	ng Outcome 1																		
Т.	alth																		
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)  No available services	3	5	•	37.5 %	1	1	4	29	73.3%		6	7	23	46.2%	12	7	27 (	63.2%
	No, parent/guardian refused services		Ę	•				4					6				6		
	Unable to determine - outside services		(					0					1				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  CNS Depressants		(	)				3					3				2		
	CNS Stimulants		(	)				0					1				0		
	Cocaine/Crack		(	)				0					1				1		
	Marijuana		1	ĺ				2					4				2		
	Methamphetamine		Ć	· )				0					1				1		
	Other		Ċ	)				0					1				1		
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)  No referral by county  No, child/youth refused services	1	0	)	100.0 %		2	0	41	66.7%		2	2 1 1	32	50.0%	2	0 0	44 10	00.0%
Item 18:	Child/Family Involvement in Case Planning							•											
	se Planning/Services																		
1713	Was the out-of-home provider engaged in case planning, during the review period? (Check all responses that apply)	28	0	0	100.0 %	4	4	0	0 1	00.0%		36	0	0	00.0%	46	0	0 10	00.0%
1715	Was the child/youth engaged in case planning, during the review period?	10	0	18	100.0 %	1	8	0	26 1	00.0%		20	0	16	00.0%	26	0	20 10	00.0%
1717	Was the mother/guardian/kin engaged in case planning, during the review period?  No, efforts made but refused	14	5	9	73.7 % Å	3	7	0	7 1	00.0%		22	3	11	88.0%	30	0	16 10	00.0%
	,		,	,				U					5				J		

# Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

		<u>1st Q</u>	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 20	<u>113</u>	2nd (	Quarter	SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	<u>3rd</u> (	Quarte	r SFY	<u> 2013</u>	<u>4th (</u>	Quarte	r SFY	<u> 2013</u>
		Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	No	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Well Beir	ng Outcome 1																
	Child/Family Involvement in Case Planning																
1719	se Planning/Services  Was the father/guardian/kin engaged in case planning during the review	14	3	11	82.4 %	24	E	10	00 00/	16	2	1 17	84 2%	25		10	02.60/
1713	period?	14	3	11	62.4 % <u>1</u>	21	5	10	80.8%	16	3	17	84.2%	25		19	92.6%
	No			0			1				2				0		
	No, efforts made but refused			3			4				1				2		
	: Worker Visits with Child rmanency																
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			0				1				0		
	5			6			22				13				16		
	6		1	7			19				18				26		
	7			1			2				4				3		
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			0				1				0		
	3			0			1				0				0		
	5			6			21				17				19		
	6		1	7			19				14				23		
	7			1 _			2	_			4		<del></del>		3		
	Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child?			Ĺ	100.0%				99.2%				98.0%				%98.8
	In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?	24	0		100.0%	42	1		97.7%	32	4	]	88.9%	42	3	<u> </u>	93.3% 📤

### **Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews**

Administrative Review Division

		1st Q	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 20	<u>13</u>	2nd (	Quarte	SFY 2	013	3rd	Quarte	r SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	4th (	Quarte	r SFY	<u> 2013</u>
		Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	No	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Well Bei	ng Outcome 1																
Item 19	: Worker Visits with Child																
Pe	rmanency																
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)			0			1				0				1		
	5			0			0				1				0		
	6			4			1				0				1		
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)			4			'				Ü				'		
	0			0			0				0				1		
	1			0			1				0				0		
	3			3			0				0				0		
	5			1			1				1				0		
	6			0			0				0				1		
	Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child?																%85.7
	In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?	0	0		.0%	0	0		.0%	0	0	]	.0%	1	1		50.0% 🗘
1767	Did the frequency of contact with the child/youth in his/her place of residence occur according to Volume 7?	23	5	0	82.1 % 🚹	41	3	0	93.2% 🔥	36	0	0	100.0%	44	2	0	95.7%
	: Worker Visits with Child																
	rmanency													•			
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)	21	7	0	75.0 %	36	8	0	81.8%	33	3	0	91.7%	40	6	0	87.0%
	No			3			3				2				2		
	No assessment of safety			6			5				3				6		
	No, outside presence of provider			6			5				1				4		

# Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013			<u>2nd</u>	Quarte	er SFY 2	013	3rd Quarter SFY 2013					4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	No	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Well Bei	ng Outcome 1																
	: Worker Visits with Parents ermanency																
1769	Did the frequency of contact with the mother/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	10	0	18	100.0 %	26	2	16	92.9% 🔥	17	1	18	94.4% 🔥	21	2	23	91.3% 🔥
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?	10	0	18	100.0 %	27	1	16	96.4%	17	1	18	94.4%	22	1	23	95.7%
1771	Did the frequency of contact with the father/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	6	0	22	100.0 %	13	1	30	92.9%	8	1	27	88.9% 🔥	5	4	37	55.6% 🔥
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?	6	0	22	100.0 %	14	0	30 1	00.0%	8	1	27	88.9% <u>^</u>	8	1	37	88.9% 🔥

#### **Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews**

**Administrative Review Division** 

		1st Quarter SFY 2013					Quarter	SFY 2	<u>:013</u>	3rd (	Quarte	r SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	4th Quarter SFY 2013				
		Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	
Well Beir	ng Outcome 2																	
	Educational Needs of Child																	
	ucation																	
1737	Is the child/youth's education/school record in the case file? (Check all No responses that apply)	19	1	8	95.0 % 🚹	25	3	16	89.3%	23	3	10	88.5%	27	4	15	87.1% 🚹	
	No address of current school			0			1				2				0			
	No credit count			0			1				0				0			
	No current IEP			0			1				1				4			
	No current grade reports	<u> </u>	-	1		_	1				2	<u>-</u> .	<u> </u>		3			
1738	For children aged 3 - 5: Is the child enrolled in Head Start or another early childhood education program?	2	0	26	100.0 %	3	0	41 1	00.0%	7	1	28	87.5%	2	0	44	100.0%	
	Yes, assessed only			0			0				4				1			
	Yes, enrolled			2			3				3				1			
1739	For youth aged 16 or older: Is the youth on track to graduate and/or complete high school?	9	0	19	100.0 %	8	2	34	80.0%	7	0	29	100.0%	6	4	36	60.0%	
	GED			0			0				0				1			
	Graduated			0			1				0				2			
	Information not available			0			1				0				1			
	No, graduate			0			1				0	ı			3			
1740	Was educational stability provided for the child during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply)	17	3	8	85.0 % 🚹	23	6	15	79.3%	17	7	12	70.8%	29	2	15	93.5%	
	No, changed schools during review period			2			5				4				1			
	No, delays in enrollment			0			0				1				0			
	No, initial placement required change in school			1			0				3				0			
	No, other			0			1				1				1			
	No, schl. distr. refused to provide appropr. svcs.		_	0			0				1	1			0	_		
1741	Were the child/youth's educational needs assessed?	22	0	6	100.0 %	30	0	14 1	00.0%	26	0	10	100.0%	33	0	13	100.0%	

### **Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews**

**Administrative Review Division** 

		1st Quarter SFY 2013					Quarte	r SFY	2013		3rd C	<u>uarte</u>	SFY	<u>2013</u>	<u>4th (</u>	4th Quarter SFY 2013				
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	NA	<u>%</u>	<u>Y</u>	<u>'es</u>	No	NA	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	No	NA	<u>%</u>		
Well Beir	ng Outcome 3																			
Item 22:	Physical Health of Child																			
He	alth																			
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)	27	0	1	100.0 %	44	0	0	100.0%		35	0	1	100.0%	46	0	(	0 100.0%		
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)	5	0	23	100.0 %	21	0	23	100.0%		12	3	21	80.0%	15	1	30	93.8%		
	No, late		(	)			0					3				1				
	Yes, appointment		•	1			0					4				9				
	Yes, exam			1			21		-	_ •		8				6		<del></del> ,		
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)  No, late	3	1	. 24	75.0 %	12	1	31	92.3%	<u> </u>	13	1	22	92.9%	13	0	33	3 100.0%		
			,	l			1					1				- U				
	Yes, appointment		(	)			0					40				ວ ດ				
1745	Yes, exam	0.4		3	77.0.0(		12		00.00/	<u>.  —</u>	00	13			441	- 8		2 22 424		
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)	21	6	1	77.8 %	39	5	0	88.6%	<u> </u>	32	4	0	88.9%	41	5	(	O 89.1% <u>↑</u>		
	No statement from medical examiner		6	3			3					2				5				
	No, Medicaid		•	1			0					0				0				
	No, immunizations		(	)			0					2				0				
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through		(	)			2					0				0				
1746	Has the child/youth received regular dental care and treatment for identified dental needs? (Services delivered) (Check all No responses that apply)	18	5	5	78.3 % Å	32	1	11	97.0%		28	3	5	90.3%	32	2	12	2 94.1% 🔥		
	No treatment for identified needs			1			0					1				0				
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through		į	5			1					2				2				
	No, other		2	2			0					0				0				

#### **Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews**

#### Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013					Quarte	r SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	3rd	<u>Quarte</u>	r SFY	2013	<u>4th (</u>	4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	
Well Bei	ng Outcome 3																	
Item 23	: Mental Health of Child																	
He	ealth																	
1747	Were the child/youth's mental health needs assessed?	23	0	5	100.0 %	31	1	12	96.9%	27	3	3	6 90.0% 🔥	33	0	13	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)	20	3	5	87.0 %	18	12	14	60.0%	20	8	3	8 71.4% 🔥	19	9	18	67.9% 🔥	
	No available services			0			1				0				1			
	No referral by county			0			0				3				0			
	No sufficient services			0			1				0				1			
	No, OOH provider issue			0			1				0				1			
	No, changed MH provider			2			7				1				7			
	No, child refused services			1			1				3				0			
	No, delays of 2 + weeks			0			1				2				1			
	No, mental health systems issue			0			0				1				0			
	No, other			0			0				1				1			

#### **Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews**

**Administrative Review Division** 

	<u>1st Q</u>	<u>)13</u>	<u>2nd (</u>	<u>Quarte</u>	SFY 2	<u>013</u>	3rd (	Quarte	r SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	4th Q	<u>:013</u>				
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Systemic Factors																
Item 25: Process to Ensure Each Child Has a Written Case Plan Developed Jo	intly witl	h Pare	nts													
Case Planning/Services																
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?	25	3	0	89.3 % 🚹	41	3	0	93.2% 🦺	34	2	0	94.4%	43	3	0	93.5% 🔥
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	22	0	6	100.0 %	22	1	21	95.7%	18	3	15	85.7%	29	1	16	96.7%
not contain "nunc pro tunc" language? (Re-Review Only)																
No signed court order			0			1				3				1		
Item 29: Process for Foster Parents, Pre-adoptive Parents, and Relative Carego	ivers to	be No	tified of	f, and an Opp	ortunit	y to be	Heard	, in Any I	Review o	Heari	ng Hel	d with Res	spect to	the Ch	<u>ild</u>	
1708 Were all required parties invited to the review and given at least two week notice? (Check all that apply)	5 24	4	0	85.7 % 🚹	41	3	0	93.2% 🧘	35	1	0	97.2%	43	3	0	93.5% 🔥
No, OOH Provider			3			0				0				0		
No, Tribe/BIA (if ICWA applies)			1			3				0				1		
No, father/guardian			0			0				1				0		
No, not timely			0			0				0				2		

## **Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews**

**Administrative Review Division** 

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Q	uarter	SFY 2	<u>013</u>	3rd Quarter SFY 2013					4th Quarter SFY 2013				
		Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	•	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	
Miscellar	neous																		
Miscella Co																			
1701	Is this a court ordered review?	0	28	0			0	44	0	0.0%	0	36	0	0.0%	0	46	0	0.0%	
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)	6	0	22	100.0 %		22	0		00.0%	15	0	21	100.0%	15	1	30	93.8% 🔥	
	No signed removal order			0				0				0				1			
1704	Has the county had authority for placement within the review period? (A Fiscal Sanction may result if the answer is "No.")	28	0	0	100.0 %		43	1	0	97.7%	35	1	0	97.2%	45	1	0	97.8%	
IV-			_		_	_		_		_		_				_	_	_	
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)	5	1	22	83.3 % Å		21	0	23 1	00.0%	15	1	20	93.8%	16	0	30	100.0%	
1707	Has a timely IV-E redetermination been completed during the review period? (Re-Review Only)	1	0	27	100.0 %		3	1	40	75.0% Å	6	0	30	100.0%	4	0	42	100.0%	
Per	rmanency																		
1778	Were the previous compliance issues addressed? (Re-Review Only)	12	6	10	66.7 % 🔥		8	7	29	53.3% 🔥	10	2	24	83.3% 🦺	11	5	30	68.8% <u> </u>	
	edit Report						1							-					
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	24		0	0	36	J	3	0	43	100.0%	
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	24		0	0	36	]	0	0	46		
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	24		0	0	36	]	0	0	46		