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 2	<u>013</u>	2nd C	<u>Quarter</u>	SFY 2	<u>013</u>	3rd	Quarte	r SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	<u>4th C</u>	<u>Quarte</u>	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>
Safety O	utcome 2																
Item 4:	Risk of Harm																
Sa	afety																
1709	If there were new allegations of abuse or neglect identified during the review period, were they entered as a referral into Trails?	57	1	135	98.3 %	55	2	138	96.5%	60	C	144	100.0%	60	0	131	100.0%
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)	70	1	122	98.6 %	67	1	127	98.5%	77	1	126	98.7%	74	0	117	100.0%
	No assessment/investigation			1			1				1				0		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013					Quarter	SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	3rd (Quarter	SFY 2013	4th C	Quarter	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> %	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Permane	ncy Outcome 1															
_	Stability of Foster Care Placements															
	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) No, child/youth's needs not addressed	192	0)	100.0 %	190	2	3	99.0%	203	0	0 99.5%	188	0	3	100.0%
Po	No, unable to determine where child is placed rmanency		()			1				1			0		
1753	If the child/youth experienced one or more moves during the review period,	30	42	121	41.7 % 🔥	44	32	119	57.9% 🔥	38	41	125 48.1%	40	28	122	58.8%
1700	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)	30	42	121	41.7 70	44	32	119	<u> </u>	30	41	125 40.176	40	20	123	30.0 %
	Yes, in line with case goal and planned		24				34				35			37		
	Yes, to meet youth's specific needs and planned		6	6			10				3			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)															
	Child on child abuse		1				0				2			1		
	More than one move		ξ)			11				6			6		
	Other		5	5			2				2			4		
	Provider abuse or neglect allegations		6	5			3				3			3		
	Provider quit or closed		2	ŀ			3				0			1		
	Provider request		19)			10				14			8		
	Runaway		8	3			4				5			10		
	Temporary setting		5				5				17			7		
	Youth's behavior		12	<u>-</u>			10				16			10		
	Permanency Goal for Child rmanency															
1760	In the reviewer's opinion, is the primary court ordered permanency goal, at	186	7	0	00.4.0/	100	-	0	07.40/	404	40	4 04 40/	175	4.5	4	00.40/
1700	the time of the review, appropriate for this child/youth?	100	7	U	96.4 %	190	5	0	97.4%	191	12	1 94.1%	175	15	ı	92.1%
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?	5	4	184	55.6 %	5	5	185	50.0% 🔥	14	5	185 73.7%	15	1	175	93.8%
	No		1				0				1			0		
	No, not completed		3	}			5				4			1		
Page 3 of 20	•		·	-			•									

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Q	uarter (SFY 2013	<u>3</u>	<u>2nd</u>	Quarter	r SFY 20	<u>)13</u>	<u>3rd</u>	Quarte	SFY 2	<u>:013</u>	4th C	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 2013
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> %
	ermanency															
1755	At the time of the review, are reasonable efforts being made to achieve permanency? (Check all No responses that apply)	192	0	1 10	00.0 %	195	0	0 10	00.0%	204	0	0	100.0%	190	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)	39	56	98 4	11.1 %	45	71	79	38.8%	36	67	101	35.0%	43	72	76 37.4%
	No housing No, ICPC		3	3			3				2				2	
	No, child lack of progress		16	6			16				13				14	
	No, child/youth services appropriateness		1	1			1				0				0	
	No, other		2	4			10				7				8	
	No, parent incarc. or long term treatment program		3	3			5				6				4	
	No, parent lack of progress		44	4			50				55				53	
	No, parent(s)/guardian(s) services appropriateness		(0			0				0				1	
	No, parents whereabouts are unknown		2	2			4				5				5	
	No, placement provider does not support perm. goal		(0			0				0				2	
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)	8	1	184 8	88.9 %	2	1	192 (66.7%	10	2	192	83.3%	2	3	186 40.0%
	No, caseload/turnover		(0			0				0				1	
	No, child lack of progress		(0			1				0				1	
	No, other		1	1			0				1				0	
	No, other potential caregiver lack of progress		(0			0				1				0	
	No, placement provider does not support perm. goal		C	0			0				0				2	

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>2013</u>	3rd (Quarter	r SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	<u>4th (</u>	Quarte	SFY	<u> 2013</u>
		Yes	No	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Permane	ency Outcome 1																
_	Adoption																
	rmanency																
1757	For a child/youth with a goal of adoption, is progress being made toward finalizing the adoption? (Check all No responses that apply)	17	25	151	40.5 %	23	15	157	60.5%	21	21	162	50.0%	16	22	153	42.1%
	No CARR listing			0			0				0				1		
	No adoptive home		1	1			10				12				/		
	No, ICPC			2			0				0				0		
	No, appeal of termination			2			0				0				1		
	No, child/youth declined			1			0				2				2		
	No, court delays			0			0				0				3		
	No, lack of provider support			1			0				0				0		
	No, other			5			7				6				10		
	No, placement provider does not support perm. goal			2			2				0				4		
	No, subsidy issues			4			0				4				0		
	: Other Planned Living Arrangement																
	se Planning/Services			-				-		1		1		-	-	-	
1731	For all youth over age 16 years and 60 days, is there a comprehensive ILP	37	19	137	66.1 % 🔥	27	19	149	58.7%	43	20	141	68.3% 🔥	27	25	139	51.9% <u> </u>
	that addresses all needs identified from a state-approved assessment? (Check all No responses that apply)																
	No description or plan of services			^			2				2				1		
	No plan			0			5				2				5		
	No self-sufficiency budget			0			5 7				3 7				10		
	No state approved assessment used		4	0			7				/ 6				10		
	No, all identified needs not addressed		ı	1			7				0				2		
	No, not timely			 -			2				2				9		
	No, not updated			ე ⊿			ა ი				1				0		
	Not all ILP tabs completed			4 =			ა ე				2				6		
	Not developed with youth			ე ი			4				0				0		
1733	·	40	2	142	96.1 %	20	I	150	88.4%	50	3	140	05.20/	4.4	2	145	95.7%
1733	services to address all the needs identified in the comprehensive	49	2	142	96.1 %	38	5	152	88.4%	59	3	142	95.2%	44		145	95.7%
	assessment and the FSP 4D? (Check all that apply)																
	No referral for Chafee services			Ω			1				1				0		
	No, lack of resources			1			0				0				0		
	No, provider issues			O			1				0				0		
	No, youth refused services			1			0				0				1		
	•			•			3				•						

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Q	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 20	<u>)13</u>	2nd (Quarte	r SFY 2	013	<u>3rd (</u>	Quarte	r SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	4th C	Quarte	r 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>	<u>Yes</u>	No	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Permane	ency Outcome 1																
Item 10	: Other Planned Living Arrangement																
	ase 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	2	1	190	66.7 % 🚹	3	2	190	60.0% 🔥	3	1	200	75.0% 🚹	4	3	184	57.1% 🔥
	plan" if there is not ETP plan) No plan			1			2				1				3		
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)	3	0	190	100.0 %	5	1	189	83.3% 🚹	4	0	200	100.0%	7	0	184	100.0%
	No Birth Certificate			0			1				0				0		
	No Health Passport/medical records			0			1				0				0		
	No Social Security card			0			1				0				0		
	No State ID/driver's license			0			1				0				0		
	No educational records			0			1				0				0		
<u>Item 10</u>	: 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)	41	6	146	87.2 % 🚹	29	6	158	82.9% <u> </u>	29	10	159	74.4% 🔔	23	8	157	74.2%
	No documentation			3			3				4				6		
	No, OPPLA goal not in the child's best interest			1			0				0				0		
	No, child/youth is under 16 years of age			0			2				6				3		
	No, not reviewed annually			2			4				6				2		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

		<u>1st Q</u>	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 20	<u>)13</u>	2nd (Quarter	r SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	<u>3rd</u>	Quarte	r SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	4th C	Quarter	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>
Permane	ency Outcome 2																
	: Proximity of Placement																
	se Planning/Services																
1726	Is the child/youth placed within close proximity to his/her parents or other potential permanent caregiver's home?	118	12	63	90.8 % 🔥	130	5	60	96.3%	127	10		92.7%	130	8	53	94.2% 🔥
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?	12	0	181	100.0 %	5	0	190	100.0%	12	0	192	100.0%	8	0	183	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	100	15	78	87.0 % 🚹	103	23	69	81.7%	<u>N</u> 92	24	88	79.3%	99	21	71	82.5%
	the relationship? (Check all No responses that apply)																
	No, OOH Provider			0			0				4				0		
	No, child/youth			0			1				2				2		
	No, mother/guardian/kin		1	5			21				22				19		
	No, other			0			1				0				1		
1774	Does the frequency of visitation with the father/guardian/kin adequately	48	15	130	76.2 % <u> </u>	55	15	125	78.6%	<u>\$</u> 63	14	127	81.8%	47	19	125	71.2% 🔥
	address the needs of the child/youth to maintain or promote continuity of																
	the relationship? (Check all No responses that apply) No, child/youth			4			4				2				2		
	No, father/guardian/kin		1	1 5			13				13				17		
	No, other			0			13				0				1		
1775	Does the frequency of visitation with the sibling(s) adequately address the	63	13	117	82.9 %	67	3	125	95.7%	84	1	119	98.8%	58	4	129	93.5%
	needs of the child/youth to maintain or promote continuity of the					•		-				•	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	•	•	
	relationship(s)? (Check all No responses that apply) No, OOH Provider			7			4				0				0		
	No, county			1			1				1				0		
	No, other			1 0			0				0				1		
	No, parent/guardian/kin			ડ ડ			2				0				3		
	No, sibling			2			0				0				1		
	, J			_			J				•						

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

	1st Q	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 20	13	2nd (Quarter	SFY 2	<u>013</u>	<u>3rd (</u>	Quarter	SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	4th C	Quarte	SFY 2	<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>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Permanency Outcome 2																
Item 14: Preserving Connections																
Court																
1705 Were these ICWA requirements met? (Check all that apply)	7	6	180	53.8 % 🔥	5	4	186	55.6%	8	1	195	88.9% 🔥	11	5	175	68.8%
No court order determ. if ICWA does NOT apply		-	2			1		-		0	•		•	2	•	
No docum. of inquiry of Native American heritage			2			0				0				0		
No notification sent to all identified tribes/BIA			2			0				0				0		
No response from tribe/BIA			2			3				0				5		
No, new info obtained during FF portion of review			1			0				1				0		
Case Planning/Services																
1728 Is the department making concerted efforts to maintain the child/youth's	193	0	0	100.0 %	194	0	1 1	00.0%	204	0	0	100.0%	191	0	0 1	00.0%
connections during the review period?	<u> </u>		ı			•										
Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents																
Permanency																
Did the agency promote and support a positive and nurturing relationship	134	0	59	100.0 %	133	0	62 1	00.0%	143	0	61	100.0%	135	3	53	97.8%
between the child/youth and his/her parents? (Check all that apply)	•	-		-	-				-			<u>.</u>			<u>-</u>	
Yes, encouraged attend. at doctors' appointments		2	24			19				23				14		
Yes, encouraged attend. at extra-curricular activ.		1	3			10				16				/		
Yes, encouraged foster parents to become mentors		2	22			13				17				4		
Yes, facil. contact w/parents not in close proxim.			8			9				9				10		
Yes, facilitated contact w/incarcerated parents			2			4				4				6		
Yes, other			3			2				4				3		
Yes, provid. therap. situations to strengthen rel.		12				123				122				119		
Yes, provided transportation/funds		2	24			18				26				15		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Q	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 20	<u>)13</u>	2nd C	Quarter	r SFY 2	013	3rd (Quarter	SFY	<u> 2013</u>	4th C	Quarte	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>
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 directed at the areas of need identified through assessment?	181	12	0	93.8 % <u> </u>	181	14	0	92.8%	188	16	0	92.2%	175	16	0	91.6% <u> </u>
	No			9			13				12				11		
	No, all task time frames expired			3			1				4				5		
1722	Were all required parties addressed in the treatment plan? (Check all No responses that apply)	171	22	0	88.6 %	175	20	0	89.7% 🔥	182	22	0	89.2%	169	22	0	88.5% 🔥
	No, all task time frames expired			3			1				4				5		
	No, child/youth			1			5				1				1		
	No, county			0			3				1				2		
	No, father/guardian			0			1				0				0		
	No, mother/guardian			3			0				0				1		
	No, out of home provider		1	1			9				9				9		
	No, some task time frames expired			4			8				10				6		
1723	Does the Family Services Plan treatment plan include objectives and action steps that document clear expectations in order to achieve the	185	8	0	95.9 %	183	12	0	93.8% 🔥	196	8	0	96.1%	169	22	0	88.5% 🔥
	permanency goal? (Check all No responses that apply)																
	No, all task time frames expired			3			1				4				5		
	No, measurable			4			11				4				10		
	No, specific			0			0				1				8		
	No, time-limited			1			0				0				1		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013 Yes No NA %					Quarter	SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	<u>3rd</u>	Quarter	r SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	4th (Quarte	SFY	<u>2013</u>
		Yes	No	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>
Well Bei	ng Outcome 1																
_	: Needs/Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents																
Ca	ise 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 No current 90-day review No diligent search No, barriers to progress No, caregiver/kin provider services and progress No, child/youth services and progress No, child/youth services appropriateness No, need for add./diff. svcs. and how provided No, parent services and progress No, parent(s)/guardian(s) services appropriateness	161	32 d 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 1 4 2 2 1 3 1 4 0 3 1	83.4 %	158	37 13 5 8 2 1 9 1 1 1 0	0	81.0%	178	26 6 3 7 0 0 1 0 2 0 2	0	87.3%	164	27 13 0 8 2 0 1 1 0 0 1 0	0	85.9%
	No, permanency goal			7			5				6				4		
He	No, permanency goal date No, task time frames ealth			3 6			4 3				3 5				5 9		
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 CNS Depressants		2				24				39				33 2		
	CNS Stimulants			2 0			3				3				0		
	Cocaine/Crack			9			0				5				13		
	Heroin		1				7				6				5		
	Marijuana		-	8			9				17				20		
	Methamphetamine		2				23				25				34		
	Other			0			23 3				0				7		
	Other Opiates			4			5				7				2		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Qu	uarter	SFY 20	<u>)13</u>	<u>2</u>	nd Qı	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	3rd	Quarte	r SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	4th (Quarte	er SFY	<u> 2013</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	No	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Well Bein	ng Outcome 1																	
He	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)	32	25	136	56.1 %	2	40	19	136	67.8%	28	33	143	45.9%	37	30	124	55.2%
	No available services		()				0				1				1		
	No referral by county		2	2				0				0				1		
	No, parent/guardian refused services		18	3				14				26				24		
	Unable to determine - outside services		į	5				5				6				4		
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		4	4				3				4				5		
	Cocaine/Crack		()				1				1				1		
	Heroin		()				1				1				0		
	Marijuana		10)				9				13				10		
	Methamphetamine		•	1				3				1				4		
	Other		•	1				3				0				2		
	Other Opiates		()				0			_	1				0		
1752	If substances abuse issues have been identified during the review period for the child/youth, were substance abuse treatment services provided to the child/youth? (Check all No responses that apply)	9	2	182	81.8 %	1	12	1	182	92.3%	12	1	191	92.3%	9	1	181	90.0%
	No referral by county			1				0				0				0		
	No sufficient services		()				0				1				0		
	No, child/youth refused services		()				1				0				0		
	Unable to determine - outside services		•	1				0				0				1		

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 2	<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>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<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 se Planning/Services																
1713	Was the out-of-home provider engaged in case planning, during the review period? (Check all responses that apply)	193	0	0	100.0 %	193	0	2 1	00.0%	202	0	2	100.0%	187	0	4	100.0%
1715	Was the child/youth engaged in case planning, during the review period?	101	0	92	100.0 %	89	0	106 1	00.0%	106	0	98	100.0%	87	0	104	100.0%
1717	Was the mother/guardian/kin engaged in case planning, during the review period?	122	5	66	96.1 %	134	3	58	97.8%	134	8	62	94.4%	127	5	59	96.2%
1719	No, efforts made but refused Was the father/guardian/kin engaged in case planning during the review	80	13	100	86.0 % 🔥	91	1 7	97	92.9% 🥖	89	8 9	106	90.8%	92	1 7	92	92.9%
	period? No	1 30 1		3	20.0 70		0	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		1		22.370	<u> </u>	5	02	52.570 <mark>-1</mark>
	No, efforts made but refused		1	0			7				8				2		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

								r SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	3rd	<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	<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	ng Outcome 1																
	: 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				1		
	2			0			0				1				2		
	3			2			3				2				3		
	4			0			3				4				3		
	5		6	5			84				51				69		
	6		11	1			93				117				90		
	7			6			7				18				15		
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				1		
	2			0			1				1				3		
	3			2			5				2				2		
	4			3			6				4				4		
	5		6	5			81				62				71		
	6		10	8			91				108				88		
	7			6			6				16				14		
	Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child?				99.4%				98.7%			[98.8%				%99.4
	In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?	178	6		96.7%	178	12		93.7%	181	13] [93.3%	177	6		96.7%

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013					Quarter	SFY 2	<u>013</u>	3rd	<u>Quarte</u>	r SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes No NA %				Yes No NA %			<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Well Bei	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)																
	1			3			3				0				0		
	2			2			0				2				0		
	3			0			2				3				2		
	4			0			0				1				2 8		
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)			8			4				11						
	0			0			0				1				2		
	1			3			4				0				0		
	2			2			0				5				2		
	3		1	0			2				2				1		
	4 5			1			0				1				2 0		
	6			Z F			1				6				5		
	Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child?			5			2				U				3		%72.6
	In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?	0	0		.0%	0	0		.0%	0	0] [.0%	7	5		58.3% 🗘
1767	Did the frequency of contact with the child/youth in his/her place of residence occur according to Volume 7?	188	4	1	97.9 %	185	9	1	95.4%	192	12	0	94.1%	179	12	0	93.7% 🔥
	: Worker Visits with Child																
	rmanency		ī							. —					-		
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)	169	23	1	88.0 % <u> </u>	169	25	1	87.1%	175	29	0	85.8%	165	25	1]	86.8%
	No		1	2			5				5				12		
	No assessment of safety		1				19				21				13		
	No, outside presence of provider		1				14				18				14		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				<u>2nd (</u>	<u>Quarte</u>	r SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	<u>3rd (</u>	Quarter	SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	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>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	rmanency																	
1769	Did the frequency of contact with the mother/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	68	18	107	79.1 % 🚹	73	27	95	73.0% 👲	67	26	111	72.0% 🔥	68	27	96	71.6% 🔥	
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?	83	2	108	97.6 %	86	14	95	86.0%	85	8	111	91.4%	92	2	97	97.9%	
1771	Did the frequency of contact with the father/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	27	11	155	71.1 % 🔥	32	15	148	68.1%	26	28	150	48.1%	26	20	145	56.5% 🔥	
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?	34	1	158	97.1 %	42	5	148	89.4% 🕂	52	0	152	100.0%	43	1	147	97.7%	

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 No NA %				Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>
Well Beir	ng Outcome 2	<u></u>	<u></u>		<u>~</u>	<u></u>		<u> </u>	<u></u>		<u></u>	<u></u>	<u> </u>	<u></u>	<u></u>		<u></u>
Item 21:	Educational Needs of Child																
	ucation																
1737	Is the child/youth's education/school record in the case file? (Check all No responses that apply)	104	31	58	77.0 % 🚹	117	19	59	86.0%	123	24	57	83.7%	112	15	64	88.2% <u> </u>
	No GED/Diploma			1			3				1				3		
	No address of current school			4			4				6				0		
	No credit count		:				1				3				1		
	No current IEP		1.	- 1			6				8				6		
	No current grade reports		23	3			11				17				6		
1738	For children aged 3 - 5: Is the child enrolled in Head Start or another early childhood education program?	11	5		68.8 %	24	6	165	80.0%	15	4	185	78.9%	19	9	163	67.9%
	Information not available		()			0				0				1		
	Yes, assessed only		2	2			0				1				1		
	Yes, enrolled			9			24				14				18		
1739	For youth aged 16 or older: Is the youth on track to graduate and/or complete high school?	56	4	133	93.3 %	43	8	144	84.3%	63	1	140	98.4%	46	5	140	90.2%
	GED		4	4			3				3				1		
	GED earned		:	2			1				4				6		
	Graduated		-	7			5				8				5		
	Information not available		()			1				0				1		
	No GED		()			0				0				1		
1740	No, graduate Was educational stability provided for the child during the review period?	00	40	4 	70.00(70	/ 	50	50.00/	<u> </u>	1	0.4	07.00(00	40	0.5	05.00(
1740	(Check all No responses that apply)	96	40	57	70.6 % 🚹	78	59	58	56.9%	<u>N</u> 97	46	61	67.8%	83	43	65	65.9%
	No, changed schools during review period		33	3			29				37				32		
	No, delays in enrollment			1			0				1				0		
	No, delays in record transfer			1			0				1				0		
	No, initial placement required change in school		13	3			39				13				18		
1711	No, other		<u> </u>) 10 .		4.50	1		22.22/	4 ===	0		100.00/			4.5	22.22/
1741	Were the child/youth's educational needs assessed?	151	0	42 1	00.0 %	152	1	42	99.3%	157	0	47	100.0%	143	0	48	00.0%

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd (Quarter	SFY 2	013	3rd (Quarte	r SFY	<u> 2013</u>	<u>4th (</u>	4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	Yes No NA %			Yes No NA %				<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	
Well Beir	ng Outcome 3																	
Item 22:	Physical Health of Child																	
Hea																		
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)	188	3	2	98.4 %	189	3	3	98.4%	199	4	1	98.0%	184	7	0	96.3%	
	No provider address/phone number			3			3				4				7			
	No provider name			2			3				4				7			
	No, medical problems not documented			0			0				0				1			
	No, medications not documented			0			0				0				1			
1743	Did the child/youth receive a medical exam, medical screening, or was a medical exam scheduled within two weeks of initial placement? (Check all	48	19	126	71.6 % 🚹	66	27	102	71.0% 🔥	54	21	129	72.0%	56	18	117	75.7% 🔥	
	No responses that apply) (Initial Review Only) No, late		4	E			22				17				10			
	No, never occurred		ı	5			22				17				5			
	No, other			ა 1			4				4 0				3			
	Yes, appointment		1	1			1 12				1/				16			
	Yes, exam		3	1 7			53				40				40			
1744	Did the child/youth receive a full dental examination or was a dental exam scheduled within eight weeks of initial placement? (Check all No responses that apply) (Initial Review Only)	26	12	155	68.4 %	51	19	125	72.9% 🔥	42	11	151	79.2%	42	10	139	80.8%	
	No, Medicaid provider			0			0				0				1			
	No, late			7			11				5				1			
	No, never occurred			5			8				6				7			
	No, other			0			0				0				1			
	Yes, appointment			2			0				5				5			
	Yes, exam		2	4			51				37				37			

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013					Quarter	SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	<u>3rd</u> (Quarter	r SFY	<u>2013</u>	4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes No NA %			<u>Yes</u>	Yes No NA %			Yes	<u>No NA %</u>			<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	
Well Bei	ng Outcome 3																
Item 22	: Physical Health of Child																
	ealth																
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)	146	46	1	76.0 % Å	141	52	2	73.1%	142	62	C	69.6%	149	41	1	78.4% 🔥
	No statement from medical examiner		3	7			38				41				22		
	No, Medicaid			0			0				0				1		
	No, immunizations		1	2			6				10				4		
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through			9			15				13				18		
	No, other		_	1		_	1				1				2		<u> </u>
1746	Has the child/youth received regular dental care and treatment for identified dental needs? (Services delivered) (Check all No responses that apply)	122	24	47	83.6 % 🚹	129	26	40	83.2% 🚹	126	37	41	77.3% 🔥	112	37	42	75.2% 🔥
	No, Medicaid			0			0				1				0		
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through		2	2			26				34				35		
	No, other			2			0				2				2		
<u>Item 23</u>	: Mental Health of Child																
He	ealth																
1747	Were the child/youth's mental health needs assessed?	165	0	28	100.0 %	165	0	30 -	100.0%	173	0	31	100.0%	165	0	26	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)	102	26	65	79.7 % 🔥	102	22	71	82.3%	106	28		79.1% 🔥	94	30		75.8%
	No referral by county			0			0				1				0		
	No sufficient services			1			1				0				3		
	No, Medicaid			0			0				4				1		
	No, OOH provider issue			1			2				9				3		
	No, changed MH provider		1	6			16				17				19		
	No, child refused services			1			1				2				2		
	No, delays of 2 + weeks			5			4				14				8		
	No, mental health systems issue			5			2				9				2		
	No, other			2			1				2				0		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd (Quarter	SFY 2	013	3rd	Quarte	r SFY 2	4th C	<u>2013</u>			
		<u>Yes No NA %</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>
Systemic	Factors																
Item 25	Process to Ensure Each Child Has a Written Case Plan Developed Joir	ntly with	n Pare	nts													
Ca	se Planning/Services																
1730	Does the FSP 4 B/C contain a comprehensive description of the type and	175	18	0	90.7 % 🔥	172	22	1	88.7% 🥖	192	12	0	94.1% 🔥	176	14	1	92.6% 🔥
	appropriateness of the homes or facilities in which the child/youth was						1										
	placed during the review period?																
	Permanency Hearing Every Twelve Months																
Co						-									-		
1703	If a child has been in care for 12 months or longer, is there a court order in	124	2	67	98.4 %	97	1	97	99.0%	129	0	75	100.0%	110	1	80	99.1%
	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)			_													
	No signed court order			2			1				0				1		
<u>Item 29</u>	Process for Foster Parents, Pre-adoptive Parents, and Relative Caregi	vers to	be No	tified of	, and an Op	portunit	ty to be	Heard	, in Any I	Review o	r Heari	ng Hel	d with Res	spect to	the Ch	<u>nild</u>	
Du	e Process																
1708	Were all required parties invited to the review and given at least two weeks notice? (Check all that apply)	176	17	0	91.2 % 🔥	177	18	0	90.8%	184	20	0	90.2%	179	12	0	93.7% 🔥
	No, GAL			2			3				2				1		
	No, OOH Provider			6			1				9				2		
	No, Tribe/BIA (if ICWA applies)			2			0				2				0		
	No, caseworker			0			1				0				0		
	No, child over 12			1			0				0				0		
	No, father/guardian			8			9				4				6		
	No, mother/guardian			0			1				2				1		
															_		

8

2

No, not timely

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013			<u>2nd</u>	Quarte	r SFY	2013	3rd	Quarte	r SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	<u>4th (</u>	4th Quarter SFY 2013				
		Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	
Miscellai	neous						<u> </u>		<u> </u>				_				<u> </u>	
Miscella	aneous ourt																	
1701	Is this a court ordered review?	0	193	0		0	195	0	0.0%	1	203	0	0.5%	0	191	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)		2	126	97.0 %	95	1	_	99.0%	73	2		97.3%	76	2	113	97.4%	
	No reasonable efforts/emergency			2			1				0				1			
	No signed removal order			0			0				0				1			
4704	No, contains "nunc pro tunc" language	1 1		0			0	1		1	2	i i			0	1		
1704	Has the county had authority for placement within the review period? (A Fiscal Sanction may result if the answer is "No.")	193	0	0	100.0 %	195	0	0	100.0%	204	0	0	100.0%	191	0	0	00.0%	
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)	66	1	126	98.5 %	95	2	98	97.9%	76	0	128	100.0%	80	0	111	00.0%	
1707	Has a timely IV-E redetermination been completed during the review period? (Re-Review Only)	43	0	150	100.0 %	41	0	154	100.0%	41	0	163	100.0%	42	0	149	00.0%	
	rmanency			-		. —	-			. —		1 1				-		
1778 Cr	Were the previous compliance issues addressed? (Re-Review Only) edit Report	59	29	105	67.0 %	48	23	124	67.6%	57	36	111	61.3%	48	27	116	64.0%	
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	92		1	0	203	100.0%	0	0	191		
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	93		1	0	203	100.0%	0	0	191		
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	93		1	0	203	100.0%	0	0	191		