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>)13</u> | <u>2</u> | nd Q | uarter | SFY 20 | <u>)13</u> | 3rd | Quarte | r SFY 2 | <u>2013</u> | <u>4th (</u> | Quarte | SFY | <u> 2013</u> |
|------|--|--------------|---------------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| | | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>Y</u> | <u>es</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> |
| | Risk of Harm | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1709 | fety If there were new allegations of abuse or neglect identified during the review period, were they entered as a referral into Trails? | 3 | 0 | 41 | 100.0 % | | 4 | 0 | 39 10 | 00.0% | 5 | 5 | 34 | 50.0% | 1 | 0 | 43 1 | 00.0% |
| 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) | 3 | 0 | 41 | 100.0 % | | 10 | 0 | 33 10 | 00.0% | 13 | 0 | 31 | 100.0% | 3 | 0 | 41 | 00.0% |

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

| | | 1st Q | <u>uarter</u> | SFY 20 | <u>)13</u> | 2nd (| Quarter | SFY 2 | <u> 2013</u> | 3rd C | <u>Quarte</u> | r SFY 2 | <u> 2013</u> | 4th C | uarter | SF | <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> | Yes | <u>No</u> | NA | <u>%</u> |
| Permane | ncy Outcome 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Stability of Foster Care Placements | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cas | se Planning/Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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) | 43 | 0 | | 100.0 % | 42 | 1 | 0 | 97.7% | 43 | 0 | 1 | 100.0% | 43 | 0 | | 1 100.0% |
| | No, other | | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| Per | rmanency | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 7 | 22 | 15 | 24.1 % Å | 4 | 18 | 21 | 18.2% Å | 8 | 11 | 25 | 42.1% | 12 | 7 | 25 | 63.2% |
| | answers are appropriate) Yes, in line with case goal and planned | | | 6 | | | 2 | | | | 2 | | | | 9 | | |
| | Yes, to meet youth's specific needs and planned | | | 0 1 | | | 2 2 | | | | 6 | | | | 3 | | |
| 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) | | | | | | ۷ | | | | O | | | | Ü | | |
| | More than one move | | | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | |
| | Other | | | 4 | | | 8 | | | | 6 | | | | 2 | | |
| | Provider abuse or neglect allegations | | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | |
| | Provider quit or closed | | | 3 | | | 2 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| | Provider request | | 1 | 3 | | | 8 | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | |
| | Runaway | | | 5 | | | 5 | | | | 4 | | | | 3 | | |
| | Temporary setting | | | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| | Youth's behavior | | 1 | 3 | | | 5 | | | | 4 | | | | 4 | | |
| | Permanency Goal for Child | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | manency | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1760 | In the reviewer's opinion, is the primary court ordered permanency goal, at the time of the review, appropriate for this child/youth? | 38 | 6 | 0 | 86.4 % | 36 | 7 | 0 | 83.7% | 37 | 6 | 1 | 86.0% | 38 | 6 | (| 86.4% |
| 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? | 6 | 0 | 38 | 100.0 % | 4 | 1 | 38 | 80.0% 🚹 | 6 | 0 | 38 | 100.0% | 6 | 0 | 38 | 3 100.0% |
| | No, not completed | | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

| | | 1st Q | <u>uarter</u> | SFY 20 | <u>)13</u> | <u> </u> | 2nd Q | uarter | SFY 2013 | <u>3r</u> | d Qua | arter (| SFY 2 | <u> 2013</u> | <u>4th (</u> | Quarter | SFY | <u> 2013</u> |
|---------|--|------------|---------------|--|------------|----------|------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------|---------------------------------------|-------|--------------|--------------|--|-----------|--------------|
| | | <u>Yes</u> | No | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>Y</u> | <u>res</u> | No | <u>NA %</u> | Yes | . N | <u>lo</u> | NA | <u>%</u> | Yes | No | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> |
| Permane | ency Outcome 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | rmanency | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1755 | At the time of the review, are reasonable efforts being made to achieve permanency? (Check all No responses that apply) No reasonable efforts to return home No, other | 42 | 2 | 0 0 2 | 95.5 % | | 42 | 0 | 0 97.7% | 4 | 1 | 2 2 0 | 1 | 95.3% | 43 | 0 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, ICPC No, caseload/turnover No, child lack of progress No, court delays No, lack of effort/inadequate supervision No, other No, parent incarc. or long term treatment program No, parent lack of progress | 16 | 9 | 19 2 1 4 0 0 1 0 3 | 64.0 % | | 8 | 0 0 3 0 0 2 0 | 21 36.4% | 1 | 2 | 15 1 0 4 1 0 1 0 | | 44.4% | 8 | 10 0 0 3 0 1 2 1 4 | | 44.4% |
| 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, child lack of progress | 1 | 0 | 43 0 | 100.0 % | | 0 | 0 | 43 | | 2 | 1 | 41 | 66.7% | 1 | 0 | 43 | 100.0% |
| | Adoption | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1757 | For a child/youth with a goal of adoption, is progress being made toward finalizing the adoption? (Check all No responses that apply) No adoptive home No, appeal of termination No, child/youth declined No, lack of recruitment No, other | 3 | 3 | 38 1 0 0 1 1 | 50.0 % | | 4 | 5 0 4 0 0 1 | 34 44.4% | | 6 | 0 0 1 0 0 | 37 | 85.7% | 12 | 2 0 0 0 2 | 28 | 75.0% |

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

| | | 1st Q | <u>uarter</u> | SFY 20 | <u>13</u> | 2nd 0 | Quarte | r SFY 2 | <u>2013</u> | <u>3rd</u> | <u>Quarte</u> | r SFY 2 | <u> 2013</u> | <u>4th (</u> | Quarte | r SFY | <u>2013</u> |
|----------|--|------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------|--------|---------------|-------------|------------|---------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------|-----------|-------------|
| | | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | Yes | No | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>Yes</u> | No | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> |
| Permaner | ncy Outcome 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Item 10: | Other Planned Living Arrangement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cas | se 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) | 13 | 2 | 29 | 86.7 % 🚹 | 16 | 1 | 26 | 94.1% | 10 | 5 | 29 | 66.7% 🔥 | 14 | 1 | 29 | 93.3% 🔥 |
| | No plan | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No self-sufficiency budget | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 2 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No state approved assessment used | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | |
| | No, not timely | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, not updated | | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | Not all ILP tabs completed | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 2 | | | | 0 | | |
| 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) | 11 | 4 | 29 | 73.3 % 🚹 | 15 | 2 | 26 | 88.2% 🔥 | 10 | 4 | 30 | 71.4% 🔥 | 10 | 4 | 30 | 71.4% 🔥 |
| | No re-assessment of needs | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No referral for Chafee services | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, wait list | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 3 | | |
| 4705 | No, youth refused services | | | <u> </u> | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| 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 | 0 | 41] 1 | 100.0 % | 2 | 0 | 41 1 | 100.0% | 4 | 0 | 40 | 100.0% | 3 | 0 | 41 | 100.0% |
| 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) | 2 | 0 | 42 | 100.0 % | 1 | 1 | 41 | 50.0% | 5 | 0 | 39 | 100.0% | 3 | 0 | 41 | 100.0% |
| | No Social Security card No State ID/driver's license | | | 0 0 | | | 1 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

| | | <u>1st Q</u> | uarter | SFY 20 | <u>)13</u> | <u>2nd (</u> | <u>Quarter</u> | r SFY 2 | <u>013</u> | 3rd | <u>Quarte</u> | r SFY | 2013 | <u>4th</u> | Quarte | r SFY | 2013 |
|---------|---|--------------|-----------|-----------|------------|--------------|----------------|-----------|------------|-----|---------------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| | | Yes | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | Yes | No | <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 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Item 10 | : Other Planned Living Arrangement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pe | ermanency | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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) | 11 | 2 | 31 | 84.6 % Å | 11 | 1 | 31 | 91.7% 🚹 | 6 | 0 | 37 | 7 100.0% | 8 | 0 | 35 | 100.0% |
| | No, child/youth is under 16 years of age | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | |
| | No, documented reasons not appropriate | | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, other | | | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |

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 | 2013 | 3rd (| Quarte | r SFY | <u>2013</u> | 4th Q | <u>uarter</u> | SFY | <u> 2013</u> |
|---------|--|--------------|---------------|-----------|-----------------|-------|-----------|-----------|----------|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| | | Yes | <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> | Yes | No | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> |
| Permane | ency Outcome 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | : Proximity of Placement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ca | se Planning/Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1726 | Is the child/youth placed within close proximity to his/her parents or other potential permanent caregiver's home? | 34 | 3 | 7 | 91.9 % 🚹 | 33 | 3 | 7 | 91.7% 🔥 | 36 | 5 | 3 | 87.8% | 34 | 2 | 8 | 94.4% 🚹 |
| 1727 | If a child/youth is not placed in close proximity to his/her parents or other | 4 | 0 | 40 | 100.0 % | 3 | 0 | 40 ′ | 100.0% | 6 | 0 | 38 | 100.0% | 8 | 0 | 36 | 100.0% |
| | potential permanent caregiver's home, were reasonable efforts made to support or facilitate face-to-face contact with the parents or potential | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | permanent caregivers? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | : Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pe | rmanency | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | <u>-</u> |
| 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 | 26 | 2 | 16 | 92.9 % <u> </u> | 22 | 7 | 14 | 75.9% 🗘 | 30 | 3 | 11 | 90.9% 🔥 | 19 | 5 | 20 | 79.2% <u> </u> |
| | the relationship? (Check all No responses that apply) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | No, GAL | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | |
| | No, child/youth | | , | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, county | | |)) | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | |
| | No, court | | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, mother/guardian/kin | | | 0 | | | 6 | | | | 2 | | | | 3 | | |
| | No, other | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 2 | | |
| 1774 | Does the frequency of visitation with the father/guardian/kin adequately | 13 | 2 | 29 | 86.7 % 🔥 | 13 | 4 | 26 | 76.5% 🔥 | 16 | 6 | 22 | 72.7% 🔥 | 14 | 2 | 28 | 87.5% 🔥 |
| | address the needs of the child/youth to maintain or promote continuity of | | - | • | | - | • | - | | | | - | | | | | |
| | the relationship? (Check all No responses that apply) | | | _ | | | | | | | • | | | | • | | |
| | No, child/youth | | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, court | | | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, father/guardian/kin No, other | | | 0 | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | | 0 | | |
| 1775 | Does the frequency of visitation with the sibling(s) adequately address the | 44 | 0 | 0 | 07.5.0(| 40 | 0 | 00 | 00.00/ | 00 | | | 100.00 | 40 | <u> </u> | 00 | 00.00(|
| 1773 | needs of the child/youth to maintain or promote continuity of the | 14 | 2 | 28 | 87.5 % 🔥 | 18 | 2 | 23 | 90.0% | 22 | 0 | 22 | 100.0% | 16 | 2 | 26 | 88.9% 🔥 |
| | relationship(s)? (Check all No responses that apply) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | No, GAL | | | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | |
| | No, county | | | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | |
| | No, court | | | 2 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | |
| | No, other | | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 2 | | |
| | No, parent/guardian/kin | | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

| | | 1st Q | uarter | SFY 20 | <u>)13</u> | 2nd (| Quarter | SFY 2 | <u>013</u> | 3rd | Quarte | r SFY | <u>2013</u> | 4th (| Quarter | SFY 2 | <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> | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> |
| Permanency | y Outcome 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Item 14: Pro | reserving Connections | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Court | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1705 W | ere these ICWA requirements met? (Check all that apply) | 1 | 2 | 41 | 33.3 % 🔥 | 1 | 0 | 42 1 | 00.0% | 0 | 1 | 43 | 0.0% 🔥 | 2 | 0 | 42 1 | 00.0% |
| | No court order determ. if ICWA does NOT apply | | <u> </u> | 1 | | | 0 | | | <u> </u> | 0 | 1 | | | 0 | | |
| | No notification sent to all identified tribes/BIA | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| Case I | Planning/Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1728 Is | the department making concerted efforts to maintain the child/youth's | 44 | 0 | 0 | 100.0 % | 43 | 0 | 0 1 | 00.0% | 44 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% | 44 | 0 | 0 1 | 00.0% |
| | onnections during the review period? | | | | <u></u> | 4 | | 8 | | 4 | | | | | - | | |
| | elationship of Child in Care with Parents | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Perma | anency | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | id the agency promote and support a positive and nurturing relationship | 27 | 2 | 15 | 93.1 % 🔥 | 29 | 0 | 14 1 | 00.0% | 29 | 3 | 12 | 90.6% 🗘 | 23 | 0 | 21 1 | 00.0% |
| be | etween the child/youth and his/her parents? (Check all that apply) | | - | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | |
| | Yes, encouraged attend. at doctors' appointments | | | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 3 | | | | 0 | | |
| | Yes, encouraged attend. at extra-curricular activ. | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | Yes, encouraged foster parents to become mentors | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 2 | | |
| | Yes, facil. contact w/parents not in close proxim. | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | Yes, other | | 2 | 4 | | | 24 | | | | 17 | | | | 16 | | |
| | Yes, provid. therap. situations to strengthen rel. | | 1 | 9 | | | 19 | | | | 26 | | | | 20 | | |
| | Yes, provided transportation/funds | | | 9 | | | 12 | | | | 21 | | | | 12 | | |

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

| | | <u>1st Q</u> | <u>uarter</u> | SFY 20 | <u>)13</u> | 2nd (| Quarter | SFY 2 | <u>013</u> | <u>3rd (</u> | Quarte | r SFY | 2013 | 4th C | Quarte | r 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 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | : Needs/Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents use Planning/Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1721 | Does the Family Services Plan treatment plan document services that are directed at the areas of need identified through assessment? No | 41 | 3 | 0 | 93.2 % 🚹 | 43 | 0 | 0 1 | 00.0% | 42 | 2 | | 0 95.5% | 44 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| | No, all task time frames expired | | | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| 1722 | Were all required parties addressed in the treatment plan? (Check all No responses that apply) | 33 | 11 | 0 | 75.0 % 🚹 | 39 | 4 | 0 | 90.7% 🔥 | 36 | 7 | , | 1 83.7% 🔥 | 40 | 4 | 0 | 90.9% |
| | No, all task time frames expired | | | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 2 | | |
| | No, child/youth | | | 3 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, mother/guardian | | | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, other | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 5 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, out of home provider | | | 2 | | | 3 | | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | |
| | No, some task time frames expired | | | 2 | | | 1 | | | | 2 | | | | 1 | | |
| 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) | 37 | 7 | 0 | 84.1 % 🔥 | 40 | 3 | 0 | 93.0% | 35 | 9 | | 0 79.5% 🚹 | 42 | 2 | 0 | 95.5% |
| | No, all task time frames expired | | | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 2 | | |
| | No, measurable | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, specific | | | 5 | | | 3 | | | | 9 | | | | 0 | | |

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

| | | 1st Q | <u>uarter</u> | SFY 20 | <u>13</u> | 2nd 0 | Quarter | SFY 2 | <u>013</u> | <u>3rd (</u> | Quarte | r SFY | <u> 2013</u> | 4th C | Quarte | r 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> | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> |
| Well Bei | ng Outcome 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Item 17 | : Needs/Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ca | se Planning/Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1724 | Does the most recent 90-day review/Court report in Trails meet Volume 7 | 38 | 6 | 0 | 86.4 % 🔥 | 41 | 2 | 0 | 95.3% | 31 | 13 | 0 | 70.5% 🔥 | 39 | 5 | 0 | 88.6% 🔥 |
| | requirements? (Check all No responses that apply) | | • | • | | • | - | | | | | | | • | | • | |
| | No approval | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | |
| | No current 90-day review | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | |
| | No diligent search | | | 2 | | | 1 | | | | 6 | | | | 2 | | |
| | No, barriers to progress | | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, child/youth services and progress | | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | 2 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, child/youth's safety | | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, parent services and progress | | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, permanency goal | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 5 | | | | 1 | | |
| | No, permanency goal date | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, task time frames | | | 2 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| He | alth | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | 1 | 0 | | | 9 | | | | 14 | | | | 4 | | |
| | Marijuana | | | 7 | | | 4 | | | | 4 | | | | 2 | | |
| | Methamphetamine | | | 3 | | | 4 | | | | 1 | | | | 4 | | |
| | Other | | | 3 | | | 2 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | |
| | Other Opiates | | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 2 | | |

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

| | | 1st Q | uarter | SFY 20 | <u>13</u> | <u>2</u> r | d Qua | rter S | SFY 20 | <u>013</u> | 3rd (| Quarte | r SFY 2 | <u>2013</u> | 4th C | uarter | SFY 2013 |
|----------|--|-------|--------|--------------|-----------|------------|-------------------|------------------|--------|------------|-------|-----------------------|---------|-------------|-------|------------------|----------------|
| | | Yes | No | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | Ye | s No | 0 | NA | <u>%</u> | Yes | No | NA | <u>%</u> | Yes | No | <u>NA</u> % |
| Well Bei | ng Outcome 1 | | | | _ | | | | | _ | | | | | | | _ _ |
| | 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, parent/guardian refused services | 12 | 1 | 31 | 92.3 % | | 8 | 4 | 31 (| 66.7% | 15 | 2 | 27 | 88.2% | 7 | 1 | 36 87.5% |
| 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 Heroin Marijuana Methamphetamine Other | | ; ; | 8 0 9 | | | 2 0 10 0 | 2))) | | | | 4 2 5 2 2 | | | | 4 0 8 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 No, delays of 2 + weeks Unable to determine - outside services | 6 | 5 | 33 | 54.5 % | | 0 1 |) | 33 | 80.0% | 7 | 0 0 1 | 36 | 87.5% | 7 | 0 0 1 0 | 36 87.5% |
| Item 18: | : Child/Family Involvement in Case Planning | | • | _ | | | · | , | | | | U | | | | Ū | |
| | se Planning/Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1713 | Was the out-of-home provider engaged in case planning, during the review period? (Check all responses that apply) | 44 | 0 | 0 | 100.0 % | 4: | 2 | 0 | 1 10 | 00.0% | 37 | 0 | 7 | 100.0% | 44 | 0 | 0 100.0% |
| 1715 | Was the child/youth engaged in case planning, during the review period? No, efforts made but refused | 33 | 0 | 11 | 100.0 % | 2 | 9 1 | 1 | 13 | 96.7% | 29 | 0 | 15 | 100.0% | 26 | 0 | 18 100.0% |
| 1717 | Was the mother/guardian/kin engaged in case planning, during the review period? No No, efforts made but refused | 27 | 2 | 15 1 1 | 93.1 % | 2 | 3 0 | 6 | 14 | 79.3% Å | 30 | 0 2 | 12 | 93.8% 🔥 | 22 | 3 0 3 | 19 88.0% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

| | | <u>1st Q</u> | uarter S | SFY 20 | <u>13</u> | 2nd C | Quarter | SFY 2 | <u>2013</u> | <u>3</u> | rd Qı | uarter | SFY 2 | <u> 2013</u> | 4th C | <u>Quarte</u> | r SFY | <u> 2013</u> |
|----------|---|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-------|---------------|-----------|--------------|
| | | Yes | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | Yes | <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 Bei | ng Outcome 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Child/Family Involvement in Case Planning | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | se Planning/Services | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | . — | | | | | 1 | | | |
| 1719 | Was the father/guardian/kin engaged in case planning during the review period? | 15 | 3 | 26 | 83.3 % 🚹 | 12 | 7 | 24 | 63.2% | <u> </u> | 19 | 3 | 22 | 86.4% | 10 | 2 | 32 | 83.3% |
| | No, efforts made but refused | | 3 | } | | | 7 | | | | | 3 | | | | 2 | | |
| Item 19: | : Worker Visits with Child | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pe | 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) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ^ | | |
| | 3 | | 0 |) | | | 0 | | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | 4 | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | | 3 | | | | 0 | | |
| | 5 | | 6 | 5 | | | 12 | | | | | 18 | | | | 10 | | |
| | 6 | | 32 | 2 | | | 31 | | | | | 17 | | | | 27 | | |
| | 7 | | 3 | } | | | 0 | | | | | 5 | | | | 7 | | |
| 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) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3 | | 0 |) | | | 0 | | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | 4 | | 2 | | | | 0 | | | | | 3 | | | | 1 | | |
| | 5 | | 10 |) | | | 13 | | | | | 20 | | | | 10 | | |
| | 6 | | 27 | • | | | 30 | | | | | 17 | | | | 26 | | |
| | 7 | | 3 | | | | 0 | | | | | 3 | | | | 7 | | |
| | Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child? | | | | 97.6% | | J | | 99.6% | | | - |] | 98.3% | | | | %99.2 |
| | In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month? | 36 | 6 | | 85.7% | 42 | 1 | | 97.7% | | 1 | 3 | | 93.2% | 43 | 1 | | 97.7% |

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

| | | <u>1st Q</u> | uarter | SFY 20 | <u>)13</u> | 2nd (| Quarter | SFY 2 | <u>013</u> | 3rd | Quarte | r SFY | <u> 2013</u> | 4th (| 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> | Yes | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> |
| Well Beir | ng Outcome 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Worker Visits with Child | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 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) 6 | | 2 | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 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) | | 2 | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| | Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | %0.0 |
| | In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month? | 0 | 0 | | .0% | 0 | 0 | | .0% | 0 | 0 |] | .0% | 0 | 0 | | .0% 📤 |
| 1767 | Did the frequency of contact with the child/youth in his/her place of residence occur according to Volume 7? | 39 | 5 | 0 | 88.6 % 🕂 | 43 | 0 | 0 1 | 00.0% | 43 | C |) 1 | 100.0% | 42 | 2 | 0 | 95.5% |
| | 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) | 40 | 4 | 0 | 90.9 % | 43 | 0 | 0 1 | 00.0% | 38 | 5 | 5 1 | 88.4% | 44 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| | No | | (| 3 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No assessment of safety | | | - | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, outside presence of provider | | 2 | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 4 | | | | 0 | | |

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

| | | 1st Quarter SFY 2013 | | | | | Quarte | r SFY 2 | 013 | 3rd Quarter SFY 2013 | | | | | 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 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Item 20 | : Worker Visits with Parents | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pe | ermanency | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1769 | Did the frequency of contact with the mother/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7? | 24 | 4 | 16 | 85.7 % 🔥 | 15 | 6 | 22 | 71.4% 🔥 | 22 | 5 | 17 | 81.5% | 14 | 5 | 25 | 73.7% 🔥 | | |
| 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? | 26 | 2 | 16 | 92.9 % 🔥 | 19 | 0 | 24 1 | 00.0% | 27 | 0 | 17 | 100.0% | 18 | 0 | 26 | 100.0% | | |
| 1771 | Did the frequency of contact with the father/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7? | 13 | 3 | 28 | 81.3 % | 8 | 3 | 32 | 72.7% 🔥 | 14 | 2 | 28 | 87.5% | 5 | 4 | 35 | 55.6% | | |
| 1772 | Was the quality of contacts with the father/guardian/kin sufficient to | 14 | 2 | 28 | 87.5 % | 10 | 0 | 33 1 | 00.0% | 15 | 1 | 28 | 93.8% | 8 | 0 | 36 | 100.0% | | |

address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the

child/youth and to promote achievement of case goals?

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

| | | 1st Quarter SFY 2013 | | | 2nd (| Quarte | r SFY 2 | <u>:013</u> | 3rd (| Quarter | SFY 2 | <u>2013</u> | 4th C | SFY 2013 | | |
|-----------|--|----------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|--------|---------|-------------|----------|---------|-------|-------------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| | | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | Yes | No | NA | <u>%</u> | Yes | No | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | Yes | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> % |
| Well Bein | ng Outcome 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Educational Needs of Child | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | ucation | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| 1737 | Is the child/youth's education/school record in the case file? (Check all No responses that apply) | 34 | 2 | . 8 | 94.4 % | 33 | 5 | 5 | 86.8% | 33 | 1 | 10 | 97.1% | 38 | 0 | 6 100.0% |
| | No GED/Diploma | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| | No credit count | | (|) | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| | No current IEP | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| | No current grade reports | | |) | | | 3 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | |
| 1738 | For children aged 3 - 5: Is the child enrolled in Head Start or another early childhood education program? | 2 | 0 | 42 | 100.0 % | 1 | 1 | 41 | 50.0% | 1 | 0 | 43 | 100.0% | 5 | 0 | 39 100.0% |
| | Yes, enrolled | | : | 2 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 5 | |
| 1739 | For youth aged 16 or older: Is the youth on track to graduate and/or complete high school? | 12 | 3 | 29 | 80.0 % | 13 | 3 | 27 | 81.3% | 9 | 7 | 28 | 56.3% | 11 | 5 | 28 68.8% |
| | GED | | (|) | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| | GED earned | | : | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 2 | |
| | Graduated | | | 1 | | | 2 | | | | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| | Information not available | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 2 | |
| | No GED | | (|) | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| | No, graduate | | : | 2 | | | 1 | | | | 7 | | | | 3 | |
| 1740 | Was educational stability provided for the child during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply) | 14 | 22 | 8 | 38.9 % | 21 | 17 | 5 | 55.3% | 24 | 10 | 10 | 70.6% | 26 | 14 | 4 65.0% |
| | No, changed schools during review period | | 2 | 2 | | | 17 | | | | 7 | | | | 11 | |
| | No, delays in enrollment | | _ | _) | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | |
| | No, initial placement required change in school | | | 2 | | | 3 | | | | 1 | | | | 3 | |
| | No, other | | |) | | | 0 | | | | 2 | | | | 0 | |
| 1741 | Were the child/youth's educational needs assessed? | 37 | 0 | 7 | 100.0 % | 36 | 2 | 5 | 94.7% 🔥 | 21 | 3 | 20 | 87.5% | 35 | 0 | 9 100.0% |

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

| | | 1st Quarter SFY 2013 | | | <u>013</u> | 2nd 0 | Quarte | r SFY 2 | <u>2013</u> | 3rd | Quarte | r SFY | 2013 | 4th C | 4th Quarter SFY 2013 | | | | |
|-----------|--|----------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------|----------|-------|----------------------|-----------|----------|--|--|
| | | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | Yes | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | Yes | <u>No</u> | NA | <u>%</u> | Yes | No | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | | |
| Well Beir | ng Outcome 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | : Physical Health of Child | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 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) | 44 | 0 | 0 | 100.0 % | 43 | 0 | 0 1 | 00.0% | 44 | (|) (| 0100.0% | 44 | 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 | 12 | 5 | 27 | 70.6 % 🔥 | 9 | 4 | 30 | 69.2% | 11 | 7 | 7 20 | 6 61.1% | 9 | 0 | 35 | 100.0% | | |
| | No responses that apply) (Initial Review Only) No, late | | ı | 5 | | | 1 | | | | 7 | | | | 0 | | | | |
| | Yes, appointment | | - | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | |
| | Yes, exam | | 10 | | | | 9 | | | | 10 | | | | 9 | | | | |
| 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) | 11 | 3 | 30 | 78.6 % Å | 10 | 1 | 32 | 90.9% | 7 | Ę | 32 | 2 58.3% | 5 | 2 | 37 | 71.4% | | |
| | No, late | | • | | | | 1 | | | | 5 | | | | 2 | | | | |
| | No, other | | 2 | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | |
| | Yes, appointment | | (|) | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | |
| 4745 | Yes, exam | | 11 | <u> </u> | | | 9 | | | | 6 | 1 | | | 5 | | | | |
| 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) | 39 | 2 | 3 | 95.1 % | 41 | 1 | 1 | 97.6% | 41 | 2 | 2 | 1 95.3% | 42 | 1 | 1 | 97.7% | | |
| | No statement from medical examiner | | (|) | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | |
| | No treatment for identified needs | | (|) | | | 0 | | | | 2 | | | | 0 | | | | |
| | No, immunizations | | • | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | |
| | No, lack of timely referral or follow through | | | <u> </u> | | | 0 | | | _ | 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) | 32 | 2 | 10 | 94.1 % 🚹 | 30 | 7 | 6 | 81.1% | <u>\</u> 31 | 2 | 1 ! | 9 88.6% | 35 | 5 | 4 | 87.5% | | |
| | No, lack of timely referral or follow through | | 2 | 2 | | | 7 | | | | 4 | | | | 5 | | | | |

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

| | | 1st Quarter SFY 2013 | | | | | Quarter | r SFY 2 | <u> 2013</u> | 3rd | Quarte | <u> 2013</u> | 4th C | 4th Quarter SFY 2013 | | | |
|-----------------|---|----------------------|-----------|------------|---------------------|----------------|---------|-----------|--------------|-------|---------|--------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------|------------|----------|
| | | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | Yes | No | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | Yes | No | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | Yes | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> |
| Well Bei | ng Outcome 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| _ | : Mental Health of Child | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | alth | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1747 | Were the child/youth's mental health needs assessed? | 29 | 0 | 15 | 100.0 % | 30 | 0 | 13 | 100.0% | 26 | C | 18 | 100.0% | 29 | 0 | 151 | 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) | 14 | 13 | 17 | 51.9 % 🚹 | 20 | 10 | 13 | 66.7% 🔥 | 20 | 7 | 17 | 74.1% 🔥 | 26 | 5 | 13 | 83.9% |
| | No, OOH provider issue | | | 1 | | | 4 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, changed MH provider | | 1 | 0 | | | 5 | | | | 4 | | | | 3 | | |
| | No, child refused services | | | 0 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, delays of 2 + weeks No, other | | | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | |
| Crystoreia | · | | | U | | | U | | | | 2 | | | | ı | | |
| Systemic | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | : Process to Ensure Each Child Has a Written Case Plan Developed Joi | ntly with | Pare | <u>nts</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | se Planning/Services | | T | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | Т | |
| 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? | 41 | 3 | 0 | 93.2 % | 39 | 3 | 1 | 92.9% | 34 | . 2 | 8 | 94.4% | 43 | 1 | 0 | 97.7% |
| <u>Item 27</u> | : Permanency Hearing Every Twelve Months | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Co | urt | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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) | 24 | 0 | 20 | 100.0 % | 31 | 0 | 12 | 100.0% | 23 | C | 21 | 100.0% | 32 | 0 | 12 | 100.0% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | : Process for Foster Parents, Pre-adoptive Parents, and Relative Caregi | ivers to | be No | tified of | <u>, and an Opp</u> | <u>ortunit</u> | y to be | Heard | d, in Any R | eview | or Hear | ng He | ld with Res | pect to | the Ch | <u>ild</u> | |
| | e Process | Г.,.Т | | | | | | | 22.22/ | г | 1 - | _ | | 1 | | | |
| 1708 | Were all required parties invited to the review and given at least two weeks notice? (Check all that apply) | 41 | 3 | 0 | 93.2 % 🗘 | 40 | 3 | 0 | 93.0% 🗘 | 41 | | 0 | 93.2% <u>^</u> | 44 | 0 | 0 1 | 100.0% |
| | No, Attorneys of Record (Court Ordered) | | | 2 | | | 0 | | | | 3 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, OOH Provider | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, child over 12 No, father/guardian | | | U | | | 2 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| | No, nather/guardian No, mother/guardian | | | U 1 | | | 7 | | | | 0 | | | | O O | | |
| | No, mononguaruan | | | 1 | | | U | | | | U | | | | U | | |

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

| | | 1st Quarter SFY 2013 | | | | | <u>2nd Q</u> | <u>uarter</u> | 2013 | 3rd Quarter SFY 2013 | | | | | 4th Quarter SFY 2013 | | | | | |
|----------|--|----------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|--------------|---------------|-----------|----------------------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|----------|--|
| | | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | , | Yes | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>Y</u> | <u>′es</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | Yes | <u>No</u> | <u>NA</u> | <u>%</u> | |
| Miscella | neous | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Miscell | aneous | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | ourt | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1701 | Is this a court ordered review? | 9 | 35 | 0 | 20.5 % | | 7 | 36 | 0 | 16.3% | | 10 | 34 | 0 | 22.7% | 11 | 33 | 0 | 25.0% | |
| 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) | 17 | 0 | 27 | 100.0 % | | 12 | 1 | 30 | 92.3% | <u> </u> | 17 | 1 | 26 | 94.4% | 8 | 1 | 35 | 88.9% | |
| | No best interest | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | | |
| 4704 | No reasonable efforts/emergency | | | 0 | | _ | | 1 | - 1 | | _ | - | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | |
| 1704 | Has the county had authority for placement within the review period? (A Fiscal Sanction may result if the answer is "No.") | 44 | 0 | 0 | 100.0 % | | 43 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% | <u> </u> | 44 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% | 44 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% | |
| IV- | • | | | ī | | _ | | 1 | | | _ | | | | | 1 | - | | | |
| 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) | 17 | 0 | 27 | 100.0 % | | 13 | 0 | 30 | 100.0% | | 18 | 0 | 26 | 100.0% | 9 | 0 | 35 | 100.0% | |
| 1707 | Has a timely IV-E redetermination been completed during the review period? (Re-Review Only) | 7 | 0 | 37 | 100.0 % | | 4 | 0 | 39 | 100.0% | | 3 | 0 | 41 | 100.0% | 11 | 0 | 33 | 100.0% | |
| Pe | rmanency | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1778 | Were the previous compliance issues addressed? (Re-Review Only) | 9 | 0 | 35 | 100.0 % | | 13 | 3 | 27 | 81.3% | • | 8 | 4 | 32 | 66.7% | 6 | 0 | 38 | 100.0% | |
| Cr | edit Report | | J. | <u>L</u> | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | U | | | · · | | | | |
| 1779 | If the youth is 16 years and older have the youth and the GAL received a copy of all consumer credit reports annually? No, not requested | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 25 | | | 0 | 0 | 42 | | 5 | 0 | 36 | 100.0% | |
| | No, requested but not received - Equifax | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | | 0 | | | | 2 | | | |
| | No, requested but not received - Experian No, requested but not received - TransUnion | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | | 2 | | | | 1 | | | |
| 1780 | If the youth is 16 years and older and has a credit report with evidence of | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 25 | | | | 0 | 44 | ı r | 0 | 0 | 44 | | |
| 1700 | inaccuracies, has the county department or the GAL referred the youth to an approved agency to resolve the inaccuracies? | U | 0 | U | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | U U | 25 | | L | U | U | 44 | <u> </u> | U _I | <u> </u> | 44 | | |
| 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 | 25 | | | 0 | 0 | 44 |] [| 0 | 0 | 44 | | |