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

		1st Quarter SFY 2013 Yes No NA %				<u>2nd</u>	Quarte	er SFY 2	<u>1013</u>	<u>3rd</u>	<u>Quarte</u>	r SFY 2	<u>:013</u>	4th C	<u>Quarte</u>	r SFY	<u> 2013</u>
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Safety O	utcome 2																
Item 4:	Risk of Harm																
Sa	fety																
1709	If there were new allegations of abuse or neglect identified during the review period, were they entered as a referral into Trails?	13	0	63	100.0 %	4	0	50 1	00.0%	18	1	58	94.7% 🔥	12	1	77	92.3% 🚹
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	5	0	71	100.0 %	4	0	50 1	00.0%	13	1	63	92.9% 🔥	9	0	81 1	00.0%
	period? (Check all No responses that apply) No, other		(0			0				1				0		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013					Quarter	SFY 2	013	3rd C	uarter	SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	4th C	uarter	SFY 2013
		Yes No NA % You			Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	<u>NA</u> %	
Permane	ncy Outcome 1															
	Stability of Foster Care Placements															
	se Planning/Services															
	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)	76	0	0	100.0 %	51	0	3 1	00.0%	74	1	2	98.7%	90	0	0 100.0%
	No, unable to determine where child is placed		()			0				1				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	12	8	56	60.0 % 🔥	12	12	30	50.0% 🛕	14	19	44	42.4%	12	10	68 54.5%
4754	answers are appropriate) Yes, in line with case goal and planned Yes, to meet youth's specific needs and planned		1	1 1			10 2				10 4				10 2	
1754	If the child/youth experienced one or more moves during the review period that were not planned, what was/were the reason(s) for the move(s)? (Check all that apply)															
	More than one move			1			3				0				0	
	Other		()			3				9				1	
	Provider abuse or neglect allegations		:	2			1				2				1	
	Provider quit or closed		()			0				0				4	
	Provider request		:	2			4				6				2	
	Runaway			5			5				5				5	
	Temporary setting			1			0				3				4	
	Youth's behavior			1			4				7				3	
	Permanency Goal for Child Tmanency															
1760	<u>-</u>	0.4	44 [- 1	25.0.0/	40		41	00.00/		00	-	74.40/	07	00	0 74 40/
1760	In the reviewer's opinion, is the primary court ordered permanency goal, at the time of the review, appropriate for this child/youth?	64	11	1	85.3 %	46	/	1	86.8%	55	22	0	71.4%	67	23	0 74.4%
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?	0	0	76	0.0 %	0	0	54	Ι	0	2	75	0.0%	1	0	89 100.0%
	No)			0				1				0	
	No, not completed)			0				1				0	

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013					Quarte	r SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	<u>3rd</u>	Quarte	r SFY	<u>2013</u>	<u>4th C</u>	Quarter	SFY	<u> 2013</u>
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Permane	ency Outcome 1																
Pe	ermanency																
1755	At the time of the review, are reasonable efforts being made to achieve permanency? (Check all No responses that apply)	76	0	0	100.0 %	54	0	0	100.0%	77	0	C	00.0%	90	0	0	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)	13	27	36	32.5 %	3	22	29	12.0%	2	41	34	4.7%	24	45	21	34.8%
	No, child lack of progress No, other		;	3 1			4				7 1				3 3		
	No, parent incarc. or long term treatment program		:	1 2			1				5				4		
	No, parent lack of progress		2	7			19				36				39		
	No, parents whereabouts are unknown		(0			0				6				3		
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)	0	0	76	0.0 %	4	1	49	80.0%	1	3	73	25.0%	1	1	88	50.0%
	No, child lack of progress		(0			0				0				1		
	No, other		(0			1				3				1		
	<u>Adoption</u>																
	ermanency																
1757	For a child/youth with a goal of adoption, is progress being made toward finalizing the adoption? (Check all No responses that apply)	3	3	70	50.0 %	7	4	43	63.6%	5	3	69	62.5%	9	4	77	69.2%
	No adoptive home		;	3			3				0				1		
	No, appeal of termination		(0			0				0				1		
	No, child/youth declined		(0			0				1				1		
	No, lack of provider support		(0			0				1				0		
	No, other		(U			1				1				2		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013					Quarter	SFY 2	013	3rd (Quarter	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	No	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Permane	ncy Outcome 1																
Item 10:	Other Planned Living Arrangement																
	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)	16	2	58	88.9 % 🔥	11	1	42	91.7% 🔥	11	6	60	64.7% 🔥	9	1	80	90.0% 🚹
	No description or plan of services			1			0				1				0		
	No plan		()			0				1				1		
	No self-sufficiency budget		•	1			1				4				0		
	No state approved assessment used		2	2			0				4				0		
	No, all identified needs not addressed		•	1			0				1				0		
4===	Not all ILP tabs completed			2			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)	17	1	58	94.4 % 🚹	9	1	44	90.0%	14	2	61	87.5%	9	1	80	90.0%
	No re-assessment of needs		•	1			0				1				0		
	No referral for Chafee services		•	1			0				0				1		
4705	No, wait list		()		-	1	-		-	1		r		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)	4	0	72	100.0 %	0	1	53	0.0%	0	0	77		1	1	88	50.0%
	No plan		()			1				0				0		
	No, not timely		()			0				0				1		
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	73	100.0 %	1	0	53 1	00.0%	0	0	77	[2	0	88	100.0%

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013			<u>)13</u>	<u>2nd (</u>	<u>Quarte</u>	r SFY 2	<u>013</u>	<u>3rd</u> (<u>Quarte</u>	r SFY	<u> 2013</u>	<u>4th (</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>	Yes	No	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Permane	ency Outcome 1																
Item 10	: Other Planned Living Arrangement																
Pe	rmanency																
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)	25	4	47	86.2 % Å	10	1	41	90.9% 📤	16	3	55	84.2%	5	0	85	100.0%
	No, child/youth is under 16 years of age			0			2				3				0		
	No, documented reasons not appropriate			1			1				2				0		
	No, not reviewed annually			0			0				1				0		
	No, other			3			0				2				0		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013					2nd Q	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 2	<u>013</u>	<u>.</u>	3rd Q	uarter	SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	4th (Quarte	r SFY	2013
		<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>Y</u> e	es_	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Permane	ncy Outcome 2																		
Item 11:	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?	49	1	26	98.0 %		35	1	18	97.2%		54	1	22	98.2%	83	0	7	100.0%
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?	1	0	75	100.0 %		0	0	54			1	0	76	100.0%	5	0	85	100.0%
	Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care																		
1773	rmanency	1 45 1	- 1	0.4	00.5.0/		00	41	0.1	07.00/	. —	07	20		04.00/	041	40	40	05.00(
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	45	1	24	86.5 %	<u> </u>	29	4	21	87.9%		37	20	20	64.9%	61	10	19	85.9% 🔥
	the relationship? (Check all No responses that apply)																		
	No, child/youth			1				0					1				2		
	No, court			1				0					2				1		
	No, mother/guardian/kin			5				4					18				6		
	No, other			1				0					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)	25	9	42	73.5 % 🕂	4	14	7	33	66.7% 🛓	<u> </u>	21	13	43	61.8%	28	11	51	71.8%
	No, child/youth			1				1					0				0		
	No, court		(0				0					2				0		
	No, father/guardian/kin			8				6					11				10		
	No, other			1				0					0				1		
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)	46	1	29	97.9 %		31	0	23 1	00.0%	<u>L</u>	46	4	27	92.0%	65	4	21	94.2%
	No, OOH Provider			0				0					0				2		
	No, other		(0				0					4				2		
	No, parent/guardian/kin			1				0					0				1		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Q	<u>uarter</u>	SFY 20	<u>013</u>	<u>2nd</u> (Quarte	r SFY 2	<u>013</u>	3rd	Quarte	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>	<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>
Permane	ency Outcome 2																
	: Preserving Connections ourt																
1705	Were these ICWA requirements met? (Check all that apply)	3	1	72	75.0 % 🔥	1	5	48	16.7% 🥖	1	4	72	20.0% 🤌	8	8	74	50.0% 🔥
	No court order determ. if ICWA does NOT apply	<u>. </u>		1			0				3	l			1		
	No docum. of inquiry of Native American heritage			0			2				0				2		
	No notification sent to all identified tribes/BIA			0			0				1				2		
	No response from tribe/BIA			0			3				0				3		
	No, new info obtained during FF portion of review			0			0				0				1		
Ca	se Planning/Services																
1728	Is the department making concerted efforts to maintain the child/youth's connections during the review period?	75	0	1	100.0 %	50	0	4 1	00.0%	68	0	9	100.0%	82	0	8	100.0%
	: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents rmanency																
1777	Did the agency promote and support a positive and nurturing relationship	52	0	24	100.0 %	33	1	20	97.1%	52	0	25	100.0%	67	1	22	98.5%
	between the child/youth and his/her parents? (Check all that apply)		•		-	-	_	-	-		0	-	-	•	4	•	.
	Yes, encouraged attend. at doctors' appointments			4			1				0				0		
	Yes, other			6			5				45				О Б/I		
	Yes, provide transportation funds		4	. ა			30				45				54		
	Yes, provided transportation/funds		3	57			26				33				47		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

<u>Yes No NA % Yes No NA % Yes No NA</u>	<u>% Yes No NA %</u>
Well Being Outcome 1	
Item 17: Needs/Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents	
Case Planning/Services	
directed at the areas of need identified through assessment?	96.1% 87 3 0 96.7%
<i>N</i> o 1 5 3	0
No, all task time frames expired 1 0	3
1722 Were all required parties addressed in the treatment plan? (Check all No 68 8 0 89.5 % 1 48 6 0 88.9% 1 69 8 0 8 responses that apply)	89.6% 81 9 0 90.0%
No, all task time frames expired 1 0	3
No, child/youth 0 4 0	0
No, county 0 0	1
No, father/guardian 1 0 2	1
No, mother/guardian 1 0 0	0
No, out of home provider 3 1 1	4
No, some task time frames expired 3 1 5	3
	96.1% 82 8 0 91.1%
action steps that document clear expectations in order to achieve the	90.170 02 0 0 91.170
permanency goal? (Check all No responses that apply)	
No, all task time frames expired 1 0 0	3
No, measurable 1 0 2	8
No, specific 13 4 2	8
No, time-limited 0 0 1	0

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013					Quarte	r SFY 2	2013	3rd	<u>Quarte</u>	r SFY	2013	4th (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>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u> %	
Well Be	ing Outcome 1																
Item 1	7: Needs/Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents																
C	ase Planning/Services																
1724	Does the most recent 90-day review/Court report in Trails meet Volume 7 requirements? (Check all No responses that apply) No approval No current 90-day review	67	9	0 1 1	88.2 % Å	46	8 1 1	0	85.2% 🔥	59	18 0 3	3 (76.6%	69	21 2 4	0 76.7%	J
	No diligent search			, 5			2				7				1		
	No, barriers to progress			0			0				1				1		
	No, child/youth services and progress			0			3				4				1		
	No, need for add./diff. svcs. and how provided			0			0				0				5		
	No, permanency goal			2			0				5				1		
	No, permanency goal date		•	1			0				4				6		
	No, task time frames			O			1				1				3		
н	ealth		· ·	O			•								•		
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		(6			9				9				20		
	CNS Stimulants			0			0				0				4		
	Cocaine/Crack		1	4			2				4				11		
	Heroin		:	5			0				4				7		
	Marijuana		1	8			7				8				18		
	Methamphetamine			7			10				10				23		
	Other			5			3				3				13		
	Other Opiates		!	9			16				16				20		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Qu	uarter	SFY 20	<u>13</u>	2nd Quarter SFY 2013						Quart	er SFY	<u>2013</u>	<u>4th (</u>	Quarte	r SFY	2013
		Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	<u>% Yes No NA %</u>						No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	%
Well Beir	ng Outcome 1				<u> </u>	_				<u> </u>			· <u></u>	<u>—</u>				_
7	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	26	5	45	83.9 %		11	14	29	44.0%	20	8	8 49	71.4%	43	10	37	81.1%
1751	If substance abuse issues have been identified during the review period for the child/youth, what are the substances of use? (Check all that apply) Alcohol CNS Depressants Cocaine/Crack Heroin Marijuana Methamphetamine Other Other Opiates		((3 0 0 0 5 0 1				4 0 1 0 4 1 0 4				5 0 1 1 6 3 2				5 1 0 0 8 2 0 2		
	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, child/youth refused services Unable to determine - outside services Child/Family Involvement in Case Planning	4	1	1	80.0 %		4	2 0	48	66.7%	7	0	1 69	87.5%	9	0 0 0	81	100.0%
	se Planning/Services Was the out-of-home provider engaged in case planning, during the review period? (Check all responses that apply) No	76	0	0	100.0 %		52	1	1	98.1%	77	0	0 (00.0%	89	0	1	100.0%
1715	Was the child/youth engaged in case planning, during the review period?	47	0	29	100.0 %		24	0	30 1	00.0%	42	!	35	100.0%	25	0	65	100.0%
1717	Was the mother/guardian/kin engaged in case planning, during the review period? No No, efforts made but refused	46	1	29 0 1	97.9 %		33	0 1	20	97.1%	54	2	3 20	94.7%	66	8 0 8	16	89.2%

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013					Quarte	r SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	3rd (Quarte	r SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	<u>4th (</u>	Quarte	r SFY	<u> 2013</u>
		Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>
Well Bei	ng Outcome 1				<u> </u>				_				<u>—</u>				_
	: Child/Family Involvement in Case Planning																
	se Planning/Services																
1719	Was the father/guardian/kin engaged in case planning during the review period?	32	3	41	91.4 % 🔥	15	9	30	62.5%	30	13	34	69.8%	38	12	40	76.0% 🔥
	No			0			0				6				1		
	No, efforts made but refused			3			9				7				11		
	: 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)																
	2			0			0				0				1		
	3			0			1				1				0		
	4			1			1				0				0		
	5		1	2			11				13				19		
	6		5	6			39				62				54		
	7			7			2				1				16		
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)																
	2			0			0				0				1		
	3			0			2				1				0		
	4			1			0				0				1		
	5		1	4			12				13				22		
	6		5	4			39				62				50		
	7			7 _			1	_			1				16		
	Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child?				99.6%				99.0%				100.0%				%99.1
	In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?	74	2		97.4%	51	3		94.4%	77	0]	100.0%	85	5		94.4%

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013 2n					Quarte	r SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	3rd	Quarte	r SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	4th C	Quarte	r 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>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>
Well Beir	ng Outcome 1																
Item 19:	Worker Visits with Child																
Pei	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)																
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)																
	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?	75	1	0	98.7 %	51	1	2	98.1%	76	1	0	98.7%	87	2	1	97.8%
	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)	75	1	0	98.7 %	51	1	2	98.1%	70	7	0	90.9%	85	5	0	94.4%
	No			0			1				3				1		
	No assessment of safety			1			1				6				5		
	No, outside presence of provider			0			1				4				1		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013					Quarte	SFY 2	<u>013</u>	<u>3rd (</u>	<u> 2013</u>	4th (<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>
Vell 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?	34	6	36	85.0 % Å	27	2	25	93.1% 🚹	28	12	37	70.0% <u> </u>	62	2	26	96.9%
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?	39	1	36	97.5 %	19	11	24	63.3% 🔥	29	7	41	80.6%	64	0	26	100.0%
1771	Did the frequency of contact with the father/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	13	3	60	81.3 % Å	9	0	45 1	00.0%	10	5	62	66.7%	13	0	77 ′	100.0%
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?	16	0	60	100.0 %	9	0	45 1	00.0%	13	2	62	86.7%	13	0	77	100.0%

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013					Quarter	SFY 2	<u>013</u>	<u>3rd (</u>	Quarter	SFY 2	<u>2013</u>	4th Q	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>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>		
Well Bein	ng Outcome 2																		
	Educational Needs of Child																		
	ucation																		
1737	Is the child/youth's education/school record in the case file? (Check all No responses that apply)	42	8	26	84.0 % 🚹	36	1	17	97.3%	45	3	29	93.8% <u></u>	50	4	36	92.6% 🔥		
	No GED/Diploma			1			0				0				0				
	No credit count No current IEP		(0			0				2				1				
	No current IEP No current grade reports			0			1				1				3				
	No current grade reports No name of current school			8 0			0				0				1				
1738	For children aged 3 - 5: Is the child enrolled in Head Start or another early childhood education program?	4	2	70	66.7 %	2	2	50	50.0%	6	4	67	60.0%	11	4	75	73.3%		
	Yes, assessed only Yes, enrolled			0 4			0 2				0 6				1 10				
1739	For youth aged 16 or older: Is the youth on track to graduate and/or complete high school?	12	6	58	66.7 %	10	3	41	76.9%	13	5	59	72.2%	9	2	79	81.8%		
	GED		(0			1				0				0				
	GED earned		(0			0				0				1				
	Graduated		;	3			3				2				1				
	No GED			1			0				0				0				
1740	No, graduate		1	5	22 2 2/ 4	- 4	3	4.0	00.00/		5	99	=0.00/ A	4-1			00.50(
1740	Was educational stability provided for the child during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply)	41	9	26	82.0 % 🔥	24	11	19	68.6%	<u>\</u> 36	11	30	76.6%	45	/	38	86.5%		
	No, changed schools during review period			7			10				9				5				
	No, initial placement required change in school			1			0				0				3				
	No, other			1			1				2				1				
1741	Were the child/youth's educational needs assessed?	36	0	40	100.0 %	23	7	24	76.7% 🤚	40	3	34	93.0%	41	0	49 1	00.0%		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd (Quarter	SFY 2	<u> 2013</u>	3rd (<u> 2013</u>	4th C	4th Quarter SFY 2013				
		Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	<u>%</u>	Yes	No	NA	%
Well Rei	ng Outcome 3				_						_						_
	: Physical Health of Child alth																
пе 1742	<u> </u>	70			400.004	5 4		ما	400.00/		0		100.00/	00	4	4	00.00/
1742	Is health information in the case file, including name and address of current health care provider(s), known medical problems and current medications?	76	0	0	100.0 %	54	0	O[100.0%	77	0	0	100.0%	88	1	1	98.9%
	(Check all No responses that apply)																
	No provider address/phone number		()			0				0				1		
	No provider name		()			0				0				1		
1743	Did the child/youth receive a medical exam, medical screening, or was a	30	3	43	90.9 % 🔥	22	5	27	81.5% 🗘	22	9	46	71.0% 🗘	42	22	26	65.6% <u> </u>
	medical exam scheduled within two weeks of initial placement? (Check all		-	•		•	•								-		
	No responses that apply) (Initial Review Only)			_							_				40		
	No, late		;	3			4				8				18		
	No, never occurred		()			1				0				3		
	No, other		(0			0				1				1		
	Yes, appointment		_	7			5				3				5		
4744	Yes, exam		2			-	17	-		-	20			-	37		
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)	23	0	53	100.0 %	17	2	35	89.5%	19	0	58	100.0%	47	8	35	85.5%
	No, late		()			1				0				7		
	No, never occurred)			1				0				1		
	Yes, appointment)			0				1				2		
	Yes, exam		2	3			17				18				45		
1745	Has the child/youth received regular health care, including immunizations, and/or treatment for identified health needs? (Services delivered) (Check	67	9	0	88.2 %	50	4	0	92.6%	65	12	0	84.4%	80	9	1	89.9% 🔥
	all No responses that apply)																
	No statement from medical examiner			4			2				6				7		
	No, immunizations		(6			0				1				3		
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through		:	2			2				9				3		
	No, other		()			1				0				0		
1746	Has the child/youth received regular dental care and treatment for identified dental needs? (Services delivered) (Check all No responses	63	0	13	100.0 %	41	3	10	93.2%	57	5	15	91.9%	71	3	16	95.9%
	that apply)																
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through)			2				5				3		
	No, other		()			1				0				0		

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd 0	Quarter	SFY 2	<u>013</u>	<u>3</u>	3rd Quarter SFY 2013					4th Quarter SFY 2013				
		Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	Ye	<u>s</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>		
Well Beir	ng Outcome 3																			
	: Mental Health of Child																			
	alth																			
1747	Were the child/youth's mental health needs assessed?	29	0	47 ′	100.0 %	27	0	27 1	00.0%	,	36	1	40	97.3%	41	0	49	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)	38	8	30	82.6 % 🔥	19	5	30	79.2% 🧘	7	38	6	33	86.4%	32	10	48	76.2% 🔥		
	No referral by county		(0			0					1				1				
	No, OOH provider issue		(0			0					0				1				
	No, changed MH provider			2			3					2				3				
	No, child refused services		(0			2					1				0				
	No, delays of 2 + weeks		(6			0					2				/				
a	No, mental health systems issue		(0			0					0				1				
Systemic	Factors																			
	Process to Ensure Each Child Has a Written Case Plan Developed Joir	ntly with	<u>Parei</u>	<u>nts</u>																
	se Planning/Services																			
1730	Does the FSP 4 B/C contain a comprehensive description of the type and	70	6	0	92.1 % 🔥	47	7	0	87.0% 🧘		62	13	2	82.7%	83	7	0	92.2% 🔥		
	appropriateness of the homes or facilities in which the child/youth was																			
Itom 27:	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	43	0	33 ′	100.0 %	27	0	27 1	00.0%	Π.	44	2	31	95.7%	26	0	64	100.0%		
	the case file that was signed and dated within the last 12 months that	40	U	55	100.0 70	21	<u> </u>	21 1	00.070	<u> </u>	77	۷_	01	33.1 70	20	<u> </u>	07	100.070		
	contains reasonable efforts to achieve permanency language, and does																			
	not contain "nunc pro tunc" language? (Re-Review Only)																			
	No signed court order		(0			0					2				0				
Itom 20:	Process for Foster Parents, Pre-adoptive Parents, and Relative Caregi	vore to	ha Nat	ified of	and an Onn	ortunit	v to bo	Hoard	in Any E	Pavia	w or	Haarii	a Hal	d with Pa	spact to	the C	hild			
	e Process	vers to	DE NO	ineu or,	, and an Opp	Ortuint	y to be	Hearu	, III AIIY I	VEAICA	W OI	<u>i icai ii</u>	<u>ig rier</u>	u willi ive	speci ic	tile C	<u>ııııu</u>			
1708	Were all required parties invited to the review and given at least two weeks	72	4	0	94.7 %	49	5	0	90.7% 🥂	\ 	74	3	0	96.1%	88	2	0	97.8%		
	notice? (Check all that apply)			<u> </u>	0 1.7 70 4	10	<u> </u>		00.770			Ů		00.170				01.070		
	No, GAL			1			1					1				0				
	No, OOH Provider			1			0					1				2				
	No, caseworker			1			0					0				0				
	No, child over 12		(0			1					0				0				
	No, father/guardian			1			2					0				0				
	No, mother/guardian		(0			1					1				0				

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

		1st Quarter SFY 2013			2nd	Quarter	SFY 2	<u>013</u>	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>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>%</u>	
Miscellaı	neous																	
Miscella Co																		
1701	Is this a court ordered review?	0	76	0		0	54	0	0.0%	0	77	0	0.0%	0	90	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)	33	1	42	97.1 %	27	0	27 1	00.0%	29	2	46	93.5% 🔥	64	0	26 1	00.0%	
	No signed removal order			1			0				2				0			
1704	Has the county had authority for placement within the review period? (A Fiscal Sanction may result if the answer is "No.")	76	0	0	100.0 %	54	0	0 1	00.0%	76	1	0	98.7%	90	0	0 1	00.0%	
IV-	•		- 1	40	10000	00	41	07	00.00/	00		40	00.00/	0.4		004	00.00/	
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)	33	0	43	100.0 %	26	1	27	96.3%	30	1	46	96.8%	64	0	26 1	00.0%	
1707	Has a timely IV-E redetermination been completed during the review period? (Re-Review Only)	18	0	58	100.0 %	11	0	43 1	00.0%	21	3	53	87.5% 🔥	12	0	78 1	00.0%	
Pe	rmanency																	
1778	Were the previous compliance issues addressed? (Re-Review Only)	8	4	64	66.7 %	7	1	46	87.5%	19	4	54	82.6%	4	0	86 1	00.0%	
1779	edit Report	<u> </u>	۰.					05	1		0	77		0	ما	054	00.00/	
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	U		U	0	25		U	0	77		2	0	85[1	00.0%	
	No, not requested No, requested but not received - Experian No, requested but not received - TransUnion		()))			0 0 0				0 0 0				2 1 1			
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	25]	0	0	77		0	0	90		
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	77		0	0	90		