Denver

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

Denver

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?	81	1	290	98.8 %	82	0	292	100.0%	90	2	237	97.8%	78	4	320	95.1%
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)	77	1	294	98.7 %	67	4	303	94.4%	87	0	242	100.0%	88	2	312	97.8%
	No assessment/investigation		1				0				0				0		
	No, not addressed		0				3				0				0		
	No, other		1				1				0				2		

Denver

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)	367	1	4	99.7 %	363	2	8	99.5%	319	1	9	99.7%	386	4	12	99.0%
	No appropriate level of care (sanction may result)		1				1				1				2		
	No, child/youth's needs not addressed		0				0				0				1		
	No, other		0				1				0				0		
	No, unable to determine where child is placed		0				0				0				2		

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)	72	53	247	57.6 %	67	50	257	57.3%	65	52	212	55.6%	69	70	263	49.6%
	Yes, in line with case goal and planned		59				52				52				53		
	Yes, to meet youth's specific needs and planned		13				15				13				16		
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				1				0				0		
	More than one move		12				13				14				20		
	Other		5				2				4				5		
	Provider abuse or neglect allegations		4				2				11				0		
	Provider quit or closed		2				0				2				3		
	Provider request		18				14				24				32		
	Runaway		19				21				14				29		
	Temporary setting		13				15				15				20		
	Youth's behavior		24				26				19				24		

Denver

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 7: Permanency Goal for 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	%
1760	In the reviewer's opinion, is the primary court ordered permanency goal, at the time of the review, appropriate for this child/youth?	342	30	0	91.9 %	345	28	1	92.5%	299	29	1	91.2%	364	36	2	91.0%
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?	12	9	351	57.1 %	7	8	359	46.7%	9	8	312	52.9%	20	10	372	66.7%
	No		1				1				2				3		
	No, not completed		8				7				6				7		

Permanency

1755	At the time of the review, are reasonable efforts being made to achieve permanency? (Check all No responses that apply)	369	3	0	99.2 %	369	2	3	99.5%	326	1	2	99.7%	400	2	0	99.5%
	No reasonable efforts to finalize adoption		1				1				0				2		
	No reasonable efforts to return home		0				0				1				0		
	No, other		2				1				0				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)	34	109	229	23.8 %	54	125	195	30.2%	28	112	189	20.0%	55	151	196	26.7%
	No housing		8				2				9				12		
	No, ICPC		2				1				1				1		
	No, caseload/turnover		1				0				0				0		
	No, child lack of progress		18				27				15				24		
	No, child/youth services appropriateness		0				0				1				0		
	No, county attorney		5				0				0				0		
	No, court delays		3				3				0				1		
	No, lack of community supports		0				0				0				1		
	No, lack of effort/inadequate supervision		0				0				1				2		
	No, other		9				14				8				10		
	No, parent incarc. or long term treatment program		12				17				18				15		
	No, parent lack of progress		91				98				90				119		
	No, parent(s)/guardian(s) services appropriateness		2				0				1				1		
	No, parents whereabouts are unknown		14				9				24				16		
	No, placement provider does not support perm. goal		1				0				0				0		

Denver

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	%
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)	3	6	363	33.3 %	15	6	353	71.4%	7	6	316	53.8%	21	20	361	51.2%
	No, ICPC		1				0				1				2		
	No, certification delays		0				2				0				0		
	No, child lack of progress		2				3				2				1		
	No, lack of effort/inadequate supervision		0				0				0				1		
	No, other		4				0				2				9		
	No, other potential caregiver lack of progress		0				0				0				3		
	No, parent(s)/guardian(s) services appropriateness		0				1				0				0		
	No, placement provider does not support perm. goal		0				0				1				6		

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)	84	51	237	62.2 %	43	42	289	50.6%	59	49	221	54.6%	43	35	324	55.1%
	No CARR listing		3				7				0				2		
	No adoptive home		20				15				14				15		
	No, ICPC		4				1				6				0		
	No, appeal of termination		9				2				14				7		
	No, child/youth declined		3				0				2				1		
	No, county attorney		1				0				1				0		
	No, court delays		6				1				1				1		
	No, lack of effort/inadequate supervision/training		1				0				0				1		
	No, lack of provider support		1				0				0				0		
	No, lack of recruitment		2				1				0				3		
	No, other		11				24				12				16		
	No, placement provider does not support perm. goal		0				7				6				0		
	No, subsidy issues		1				1				0				9		

Denver

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	%
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)	29	57	286	33.7 %	45	55	274	45.0%	30	47	252	39.0%	56	50	296	52.8%
	No description or plan of services		16				17				10				18		
	No plan		4				4				7				8		
	No self-sufficiency budget		44				44				31				34		
	No state approved assessment used		24				21				18				26		
	No, all identified needs not addressed		6				12				5				9		
	No, not timely		6				4				0				7		
	No, not updated		9				7				13				12		
	Not all ILP tabs completed		18				7				7				12		
	Not developed with youth		5				2				1				5		
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)	70	15	287	82.4 %	86	11	277	88.7%	64	10	255	86.5%	87	17	298	83.7%
	No referral for Chafee services		1				3				1				2		
	No, lack of resources		0				0				0				3		
	No, wait list		4				2				2				2		
	No, youth refused services		4				2				3				7		
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)	3	3	366	50.0 %	3	8	363	27.3%	1	4	324	20.0%	3	6	393	33.3%
	No plan		3				8				4				6		
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)	5	1	366	83.3 %	12	1	361	92.3%	3	3	323	50.0%	10	0	392	100.0%
	No Birth Certificate		1				0				0				0		
	No Health Passport/medical records		0				0				1				0		
	No Social Security card		1				0				0				0		
	No State ID/driver's license		1				1				1				0		
	No educational records		0				0				1				0		

Denver

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement

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	%
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)	69	19	284	78.4 %	56	30	281	65.1%	47	19	259	71.2%	53	26	319	67.1%
	No documentation		7				8				5				1		
	No, OPPLA goal not in the child's best interest		1				1				0				1		
	No, child/youth is under 16 years of age		0				7				5				5		
	No, documented reasons not appropriate		1				10				8				11		
	No, not reviewed annually		9				13				4				13		
	No, other		1				2				3				3		

Denver

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?	238	7	127	97.1 %	224	28	122	88.9%	215	8	106	96.4%	252	24	126	91.3%
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?	6	0	366	100.0 %	26	2	346	92.9%	7	0	322	100.0%	24	0	378	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)	103	50	219	67.3 %	138	58	178	70.4%	103	43	183	70.5%	172	40	190	81.1%
	No, child/youth		3				2				6				2		
	No, county		0				2				0				0		
	No, court		7				2				0				0		
	No, mother/guardian/kin		38				53				38				38		
	No, other		2				2				0				1		
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)	39	28	305	58.2 %	65	34	275	65.7%	54	23	252	70.1%	96	28	278	77.4%
	No, child/youth		0				1				0				1		
	No, county		0				0				1				0		
	No, court		3				2				0				1		
	No, father/guardian/kin		24				31				22				26		
	No, other		1				0				0				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)	122	11	239	91.7 %	114	14	246	89.1%	106	11	212	90.6%	133	10	259	93.0%
	No, OOH Provider		2				0				1				0		
	No, child/youth		6				4				4				3		
	No, county		0				3				4				0		
	No, court		0				1				0				0		
	No, other		1				2				1				2		
	No, parent/guardian/kin		2				5				1				3		
	No, sibling		6				3				3				7		

Denver

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	32	317	41.8 %	31	52	291	37.3%	12	33	284	26.7%	21	54	327	28.0%
	No "active efforts" findings		0				4				1				9		
	No "beyond reasonable doubt" lang. in term. order		0				2				0				0		
	No court order determ. if ICWA does NOT apply		16				25				23				26		
	No docum. of inquiry of Native American heritage		7				11				7				2		
	No notification sent to all identified tribes/BIA		2				7				1				6		
	No response from tribe/BIA		12				15				12				30		
	No, ICWA order of preference for placement not met		0				0				0				1		
	No, new info obtained during FF portion of review		2				2				1				2		
	No, other		2				4				1				3		
	No, tribe not notified of hearings		0				3				0				5		

Case Planning/Services

1728	Is the department making concerted efforts to maintain the child/youth's connections during the review period?	370	0	2	100.0 %	370	1	3	99.7%	326	0	3	100.0%	397	2	3	99.5%

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)	139	21	212	86.9 %	168	23	183	88.0%	137	12	180	91.9%	199	26	177	88.4%
	Yes, encouraged attend. at doctors' appointments		21				19				23				29		
	Yes, encouraged attend. at extra-curricular activ.		7				2				5				6		
	Yes, encouraged foster parents to become mentors		9				11				6				17		
	Yes, facil. contact w/parents not in close proxim.		8				16				10				19		
	Yes, facilitated contact w/incarcerated parents		1				7				1				16		
	Yes, other		15				18				7				21		
	Yes, provid. therap. situations to strengthen rel.		90				113				97				133		
	Yes, provided transportation/funds		47				47				44				51		

Denver

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?	277	95	0	74.5 %	274	100	0	73.3%	221	108	0	67.2%	306	96	0	76.1%
	No		80				76				91				77		
	No treatment plan developed		2				3				5				0		
	No, all task time frames expired		13				26				20				19		
1722	Were all required parties addressed in the treatment plan? (Check all No responses that apply)	233	139	0	62.6 %	228	146	0	61.0%	197	132	0	59.9%	280	122	0	69.7%
	No treatment plan developed		2				3				4				0		
	No, all task time frames expired		14				27				21				19		
	No, child/youth		28				23				43				16		
	No, county		9				6				5				3		
	No, father/guardian		12				19				11				19		
	No, mother/guardian		6				8				5				12		
	No, out of home provider		60				74				58				49		
	No, some task time frames expired		45				38				46				46		
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)	274	98	0	73.7 %	264	110	0	70.6%	239	89	1	72.9%	273	129	0	67.9%
	No treatment plan developed		2				3				5				0		
	No, all task time frames expired		13				27				14				19		
	No, measurable		67				70				55				99		
	No, realistic		0				2				2				9		
	No, specific		52				44				50				57		
	No, time-limited		1				1				0				4		

Denver

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)	237	135	0	63.7 %	197	177	0	52.7%	211	118	0	64.1%	264	138	0	65.7%
	No approval		2				3				5				5		
	No current 90-day review		8				12				11				15		
	No diligent search		68				98				66				67		
	No, barriers to progress		28				24				9				8		
	No, caregiver/kin provider services and progress		1				6				2				10		
	No, child/youth services and progress		54				41				19				28		
	No, child/youth services appropriateness		2				9				5				7		
	No, child/youth's safety		5				4				5				9		
	No, need for add./diff. svcs. and how provided		0				1				3				0		
	No, parent services and progress		12				19				11				7		
	No, parent(s)/guardian(s) services appropriateness		1				2				3				2		
	No, permanency goal		10				18				14				11		
	No, permanency goal date		2				10				6				3		
	No, task time frames		34				48				36				35		

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		33				43				58				71		
	CNS Depressants		1				3				0				2		
	Cocaine/Crack		31				46				33				43		
	Heroin		5				2				5				6		
	Marijuana		40				36				29				53		
	Methamphetamine		29				16				27				37		
	Other		1				5				3				9		
	Other Opiates		10				7				5				8		

Denver

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)	45	40	287	52.9 %	56	38	280	59.6%	40	58	231	40.8%	60	74	268	44.8%
	No available services		0				6				0				0		
	No referral by county		0				0				5				1		
	No sufficient services		0				0				3				0		
	No, parent/guardian refused services		37				27				49				62		
	Unable to determine - outside services		3				5				7				11		
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		9				10				6				9		
	CNS Stimulants		1				0				0				0		
	Cocaine/Crack		2				0				2				2		
	Heroin		2				0				2				1		
	Marijuana		21				33				14				28		
	Methamphetamine		1				1				2				2		
	Other		0				2				1				2		
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)	16	6	350	72.7 %	26	8	340	76.5%	10	7	312	58.8%	19	9	374	67.9%
	No available services		1				1				0				0		
	No referral by county		0				3				0				2		
	No, child/youth refused services		4				4				5				5		
	Unable to determine - outside services		1				0				2				2		

Denver

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)	356	8	8	97.8 %	361	2	11	99.4%	323	0	6	100.0%	386	6	10	98.5%
	No		8				2				0				6		
1715	Was the child/youth engaged in case planning, during the review period?	178	0	194	100.0 %	197	0	177	100.0%	153	0	176	100.0%	189	0	213	100.0%
1717	Was the mother/guardian/kin engaged in case planning, during the review period?	156	19	197	89.1 %	193	18	163	91.5%	152	20	157	88.4%	208	31	163	87.0%
	No		9				13				7				14		
	No, efforts made but refused		10				5				13				17		
1719	Was the father/guardian/kin engaged in case planning during the review period?	73	15	284	83.0 %	96	25	253	79.3%	74	19	236	79.6%	126	32	244	79.7%
	No		6				10				14				18		
	No, efforts made but refused		9				15				5				14		

Denver

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		9				0				6				3		
	2		4				11				5				6		
	3		7				5				11				7		
	4		14				26				14				24		
	5		111				102				84				129		
	6		214				211				156				200		
	7		2				8				38				20		
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		9				3				6				5		
	2		7				9				7				7		
	3		8				12				10				9		
	4		31				42				25				33		
	5		133				106				96				140		
	6		173				188				142				177		
	7		0				3				28				18		
	Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child?				96.3%				96.5%				97.2%				%97.6
	In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?	295	66		81.7%	307	55		84.8%	272	42		86.6%	347	42		89.2%

Denver

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	%
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)																
	1		3				1				2				3		
	2		1				1				1				1		
	3		0				1				4				1		
	4		2				1				2				2		
	5		10				0				6				0		
	6		9				11				10				8		
	7		0				0				4				4		
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)																
	0		3				1				4				0		
	1		3				1				2				4		
	2		0				1				7				1		
	3		0				3				7				3		
	4		3				1				4				4		
	5		13				3				1				1		
	6		3				4				4				2		
	7		0				0				0				4		
	Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child?																%82.6
	In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?	0	0		.0%	0	0		.0%	0	0		.0%	12	7		63.2%
1767	Did the frequency of contact with the child/youth in his/her place of residence occur according to Volume 7?	331	39	2	89.5 %	339	32	3	91.4%	278	50	1	84.8%	357	44	1	89.0%

Denver

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)	244	127	1	65.8 %	235	136	3	63.3%	208	120	1	63.4%	273	125	4	68.6%
	No		60				54				37				36		
	No assessment of safety		89				90				83				78		
	No, outside presence of provider		96				99				78				87		

Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents

Permanency

1769	Did the frequency of contact with the mother/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	81	55	236	59.6 %	56	108	210	34.1%	49	79	201	38.3%	86	102	214	45.7%
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?	107	25	240	81.1 %	118	42	214	73.8%	84	41	204	67.2%	150	24	228	86.2%
1771	Did the frequency of contact with the father/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	15	26	331	36.6 %	25	36	313	41.0%	24	34	271	41.4%	30	43	329	41.1%
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?	32	10	330	76.2 %	50	10	314	83.3%	27	23	279	54.0%	62	8	332	88.6%

Denver

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)	138	116	118	54.3 %	171	97	106	63.8%	135	88	106	60.5%	154	111	137	58.1%
	No GED/Diploma		8				5				2				6		
	No address of current school		17				41				18				32		
	No credit count		10				8				5				9		
	No current IEP		24				25				34				29		
	No current grade reports		96				69				58				69		
	No name of current school		9				11				9				22		
1738	For children aged 3 - 5: Is the child enrolled in Head Start or another early childhood education program?	34	5	333	87.2 %	18	5	351	78.3%	28	6	295	82.4%	25	8	369	75.8%
	Information not available		0				1				0				1		
	Yes, assessed only		3				4				2				7		
	Yes, enrolled		31				14				26				18		
1739	For youth aged 16 or older: Is the youth on track to graduate and/or complete high school?	64	25	283	71.9 %	84	31	259	73.0%	67	17	245	79.8%	86	30	286	74.1%
	GED		3				8				3				6		
	GED earned		4				6				0				7		
	Graduated		8				7				8				8		
	Information not available		4				9				5				12		
	No GED		0				6				1				3		
	No, graduate		21				16				11				15		
1740	Was educational stability provided for the child during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply)	201	60	111	77.0 %	170	95	109	64.2%	154	71	104	68.4%	171	97	134	63.8%
	No, changed schools during review period		49				70				54				65		
	No, delays in enrollment		0				0				0				1		
	No, initial placement required change in school		18				37				26				46		
	No, other		1				0				0				5		
	No, req. 504 or IEP spec. ed. svcs. were not prov.		1				0				0				1		
	No, schl. distr. refused to provide appropr. svcs.		0				1				1				0		
1741	Were the child/youth's educational needs assessed?	281	6	85	97.9 %	286	4	84	98.6%	247	6	76	97.6%	283	9	110	96.9%

Denver

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)	354	17	1	95.4 %	363	8	3	97.8%	322	5	2	98.5%	393	4	5	99.0%
	No provider address/phone number		17				8				5				4		
	No provider name		16				7				4				4		
	No, medical problems not documented		2				0				0				0		
	No, medications not documented		1				0				1				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)	60	32	280	65.2 %	75	45	254	62.5%	83	19	227	81.4%	86	45	271	65.6%
	No, Medicaid card		2				2				0				0		
	No, late		23				36				18				43		
	No, never occurred		5				9				1				2		
	No, other		4				0				0				0		
	Yes, appointment		5				6				3				8		
	Yes, exam		55				69				80				78		
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)	36	28	308	56.3 %	64	30	280	68.1%	61	18	250	77.2%	71	23	308	75.5%
	No, Medicaid card		0				0				1				0		
	No, late		7				12				9				11		
	No, never occurred		16				18				6				9		
	No, other		5				0				3				3		
	Yes, appointment		5				1				0				6		
	Yes, exam		31				63				61				65		

Denver

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)	281	88	3	76.2 %	284	87	3	76.5%	266	62	1	81.1%	319	81	2	79.8%
	No statement from medical examiner		54				56				48				52		
	No treatment for identified needs		0				0				0				1		
	No, immunizations		9				15				3				4		
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through		35				31				19				31		
	No, other		1				2				0				1		
1746	Has the child/youth received regular dental care and treatment for identified dental needs? (Services delivered) (Check all No responses that apply)	198	96	78	67.3 %	226	73	75	75.6%	213	49	67	81.3%	240	70	92	77.4%
	No treatment for identified needs		0				0				2				0		
	No, Medicaid		1				0				2				1		
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through		89				71				40				58		
	No, other		6				2				7				11		

Item 23: Mental Health of Child

Health

1747	Were the child/youth's mental health needs assessed?	302	0	70	100.0 %	285	8	81	97.3%	259	0	70	100.0%	320	2	80	99.4%
1748	Were mental health services provided to meet the child/youth's needs during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply)	185	69	118	72.8 %	167	71	136	70.2%	146	61	122	70.5%	181	58	163	75.7%
	No available services		0				2				0				0		
	No referral by county		1				1				0				0		
	No sufficient services		1				2				1				1		
	No, Medicaid		3				1				0				0		
	No, OOH provider issue		7				9				3				7		
	No, changed MH provider		32				34				37				28		
	No, child refused services		11				11				4				8		
	No, delays of 2 + weeks		29				19				19				13		
	No, mental health systems issue		8				7				7				9		
	No, other		10				3				1				2		
	Unable to determine		0				0				0				7		

Denver

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?	261	108	3	70.7 %	243	127	4	65.7%	227	100	2	69.4%	296	102	4	74.4%

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)	277	1	94	99.6 %	249	2	123	99.2%	220	1	108	99.5%	265	5	132	98.1%
	No signed court order		1				2				1				5		

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)	333	39	0	89.5 %	317	57	0	84.8%	272	57	0	82.7%	341	61	0	84.8%
	No, GAL		4				9				7				5		
	No, OOH Provider		16				16				14				16		
	No, Tribe/BIA (if ICWA applies)		1				7				9				19		
	No, caseworker		1				6				5				5		
	No, child over 12		3				3				2				4		
	No, father/guardian		9				24				17				13		
	No, mother/guardian		6				5				6				3		
	No, not timely		3				6				2				1		

Denver

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?	2	370	0	0.5 %	0	374	0	0.0%	0	329	0	0.0%	2	400	0	0.5%
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)	90	2	280	97.8 %	120	0	254	100.0%	107	0	222	100.0%	129	1	272	99.2%
	No reasonable efforts/emergency		2				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.")	372	0	0	100.0 %	374	0	0	100.0%	329	0	0	100.0%	402	0	0	100.0%

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)	89	4	279	95.7 %	112	7	255	94.1%	103	3	223	97.2%	130	4	268	97.0%
1707	Has a timely IV-E redetermination been completed during the review period? (Re-Review Only)	86	18	268	82.7 %	95	2	277	97.9%	90	9	230	90.9%	107	6	289	94.7%

Permanency

1778	Were the previous compliance issues addressed? (Re-Review Only)	81	135	156	37.5 %	69	136	169	33.7%	74	116	139	38.9%	91	142	169	39.1%

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	2	0.0 %	0	0	194		0	0	329		0	0	402	
	No, not requested		0				1				0				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	2	0.0 %	0	0	195		0	0	329		0	0	402	
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	2	0.0 %	0	0	195		0	0	329		0	0	402	