

Statewide Child Welfare

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: 7/19/2013

Statewide Child Welfare
Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews
Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Safety Outcome 2

Item 4: Risk of Harm
Safety

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1709	If there were new allegations of abuse or neglect identified during the review period, were they entered as a referral into Trails?	485	9	1462	98.2 %	400	6	1289	98.5%	441	18	1415	96.1%	389	10	1424	97.5%
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)	432	20	1504	95.6 %	415	15	1265	96.5%	457	9	1409	98.1%	424	6	1393	98.6%
	No Safety Plan			3				0				0				1	
	No assessment/investigation			10				8				4				2	
	No change in treatment plan			0				2				0				0	
	No court intervention			0				0				1				0	
	No placement change			0				0				1				1	
	No referral to law enforcement			0				1				0				0	
	No respite care			1				0				0				0	
	No, not addressed			4				3				3				2	
	No, other			7				3				2				2	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placements

Case Planning/Services

	1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1729 At the time of the review, is the child/youth placed in the most appropriate setting to meet his/her individual needs? (Check all No responses that apply)	1922	24	10	98.8 %	1647	17	30	99.0%	1838	13	25	99.3%	1782	13	28	99.3%
<i>No appropriate level of care (sanction may result)</i>			1			2				1					2	
<i>No, child/youth's needs not addressed</i>			2			1				2					1	
<i>No, cultural</i>			1			0				4					0	
<i>No, other</i>			5			6				3					1	
<i>No, relatives not considered</i>			2			0				0					4	
<i>No, sibling placement issues</i>			12			8				0					2	
<i>No, unable to determine where child is placed</i>			1			1				3					4	

Permanency

1753	If the child/youth experienced one or more moves during the review period, were all of the placement changes planned by the agency in an effort to achieve the child/youth's case goals or to meet the needs of the child/youth? (Check "Yes, in line with case goal + planned" if both Yes answers are appropriate)	321	355	1280	47.5 %		285	290	1120	49.6%		309	323	1242	48.9%		290	294	1239	49.7%	
	Yes, in line with case goal and planned			246				215					242					240			
	Yes, to meet youth's specific needs and planned			77				70					67					49			
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 in inappropriate level of care																				
	Child on child abuse			6				2					4					0			
	More than one move			84				73					61					75			
	Other			34				31					58					22			
	Provider abuse or neglect allegations			39				24					30					23			
	Provider quit or closed			41				16					12					15			
	Provider request			182				133					153					146			
	Runaway			83				64					63					85			
	Temporary setting			60				47					77					63			
	Youth's behavior			128				114					135					119			

Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child

Permanency

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1760	In the reviewer's opinion, is the primary court ordered permanency goal, at the time of the review, appropriate for this child/youth?	1775	177	4	90.9 %	1547	143	5	91.5%	1662	201	13	89.2%	1636	180	7	90.1%
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?	70	55	1831	56.0 %	41	45	1609	47.7%	91	42	1741	68.4%	81	38	1704	68.1%
	<i>No, not completed</i>			49			44				31				28		

Permanency

1755	At the time of the review, are reasonable efforts being made to achieve permanency? (Check all No responses that apply)	1940	12	4	99.4 %	1673	15	7	99.1%	1851	21	4	98.9%	1805	10	8	99.4%
	<i>No reas. efforts to perm. place with relative</i>			0			1				1				0		
	<i>No reasonable efforts for OPPA LTFC w/perm. agrmt.</i>			0			0				1				0		
	<i>No reasonable efforts to finalize adoption</i>			5			7				4				5		
	<i>No reasonable efforts to return home</i>			2			3				13				4		
	<i>No, other</i>			5			4				2				1		
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)	296	576	1084	33.9 %	285	550	860	34.1%	278	599	997	31.7%	336	596	891	36.1%
	<i>No housing</i>			36			29				25				17		
	<i>No, ICPC</i>			18			10				6				7		
	<i>No, caseload/turnover</i>			4			1				8				1		
	<i>No, child lack of progress</i>			117			112				110				113		
	<i>No, child/youth services appropriateness</i>			1			1				2				2		
	<i>No, county attorney</i>			7			1				0				1		
	<i>No, court delays</i>			22			8				7				8		
	<i>No, lack of community supports</i>			3			0				0				1		
	<i>No, lack of effort/inadequate supervision</i>			1			2				5				3		
	<i>No, other</i>			35			46				35				55		
	<i>No, other potential caregiver lack of progress</i>			10			3				3				0		
	<i>No, parent incarceration or long term treatment program</i>			51			51				52				37		
	<i>No, parent lack of progress</i>			456			424				483				458		
	<i>No, parent(s)/guardian(s) services appropriateness</i>			6			2				8				7		
	<i>No, parents whereabouts are unknown</i>			39			32				50				35		
	<i>No, placement provider does not support perm. goal</i>			2			2				0				1		

Statewide Child Welfare
Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews
Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
Permanency Outcome 1																	
Permanency																	
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)	53	41	1862	56.4 %	51	33	1611	60.7%	62	42	1771	59.6%	47	59	1717	44.3%
	No, ICPC			4				4				2				4	
	No, caseload/turnover			0				0				0				1	
	No, certification delays			0				1				0				1	
	No, child lack of progress			9				9				8				5	
	No, court delays			2				0				0				0	
	No, diligent search			0				0				2				0	
	No, lack of community supports			1				0				1				0	
	No, lack of effort/inadequate supervision			1				1				1				0	
	No, other			22				12				19				29	
	No, other potential caregiver lack of progress			8				6				6				13	
	No, parent lack of progress			3				0				1				2	
	No, parent(s)/guardian(s) services appropriateness			0				1				0				1	
	No, placement provider does not support perm. goal			2				0				4				10	

Item 9: Adoption

Statewide Child Welfare
Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews
Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 9: Adoption
Permanency

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 CARR listing

No adoptive home

No, ICPC

No, appeal of termination

No, appropriateness of services

No, caseload/turnover

No, child/youth declined

No, county attorney

No, court delays

No, lack of effort/inadequate supervision/training

No, lack of provider support

No, lack of recruitment

No, lack of timely filing of TPR

No, other

No, placement provider does not support perm. goal

No, subsidy issues

No, termination denied

Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement

1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
259	252	1445	50.7 %	197	205	1293	49.0%	261	225	1390	53.7%	242	208	1373	53.8%
		8			16				13				11		
		115			98				101				91		
		18			4				10				4		
		71			22				55				37		
		1			0				0				0		
		0			1				1				0		
		10			2				14				6		
		4			1				0				2		
		8			8				12				23		
		1			5				3				2		
		3			1				2				0		
		7			6				4				5		
		1			4				1				2		
		37			85				45				62		
		2			14				7				7		
		12			5				4				18		
		2			0				1				0		

Statewide Child Welfare
Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews
Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement
Case Planning/Services

		<u>1st Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>2nd Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>3rd Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>4th Quarter SFY 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>
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)	336	177	1443	65.5 %	258	201	1236	56.2%	322	189	1363	63.0%	307	189	1327	61.9%
	<i>No description or plan of services</i>			36			51				39				45		
	<i>No plan</i>			20			26				26				35		
	<i>No self-sufficiency budget</i>			89			110				89				96		
	<i>No state approved assessment used</i>			74			67				67				83		
	<i>No, all identified needs not addressed</i>			15			20				14				16		
	<i>No, not timely</i>			21			24				16				34		
	<i>No, not updated</i>			21			28				25				21		
	<i>Not all ILP tabs completed</i>			50			43				42				55		
	<i>Not developed with youth</i>			9			15				11				11		
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)	442	56	1458	88.8 %	394	48	1253	89.1%	454	49	1372	90.3%	437	46	1340	90.5%
	<i>No re-assessment of needs</i>			1			1				3				0		
	<i>No referral for Chafee services</i>			11			11				9				7		
	<i>No, lack of resources</i>			4			0				1				2		
	<i>No, provider issues</i>			1			1				0				3		
	<i>No, wait list</i>			11			6				7				9		
	<i>No, youth refused services</i>			15			5				9				11		

Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement

Case Planning/Services

	<u>1st Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>2nd Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>3rd Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>4th Quarter SFY 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>
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)	36	7	1913	83.7 %	25	18	1652	58.1%	23	16	1836	59.0%	30	18	1775	62.5%
<i>No plan</i>			7			18				13				16		
<i>No, not all tabs completed</i>			0			0				1				2		
<i>No, not timely</i>			0			0				1				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)	38	5	1913	88.4 %	40	7	1648	85.1%	40	4	1831	90.9%	46	3	1774	93.9%
<i>No Birth Certificate</i>			1			3				0				3		
<i>No Health Passport/medical records</i>			1			1				1				0		
<i>No Social Security card</i>			4			3				0				1		
<i>No State ID/driver's license</i>			4			5				2				2		
<i>No educational records</i>			0			1				2				2		

Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement

Permanency

	<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>
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)	404	91	1461	81.6 %	269	91	1317	74.7%	276	75	1460	78.6%	240	79	1483	75.2%
<i>No documentation</i>			31			32				30				24		
<i>No, OPPLA goal not in the child's best interest</i>			3			4				0				1		
<i>No, child/youth is under 16 years of age</i>			0			19				67				25		
<i>No, documented reasons not appropriate</i>			22			23				14				21		
<i>No, not reviewed annually</i>			30			34				29				34		
<i>No, other</i>			7			6				7				6		

Statewide Child Welfare
Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews
Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 2

Item 11: Proximity of Placement
Case Planning/Services

		<u>1st Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>2nd Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>3rd Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>4th Quarter SFY 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>
1726	Is the child/youth placed within close proximity to his/her parents or other potential permanent caregiver's home?	1149	116	691	90.8 %	1044	104	547	90.9%	1192	98	586	92.4%	1214	106	503	92.0%
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?	115	7	1834	94.3 %	108	3	1584	97.3%	105	8	1761	92.9%	123	4	1696	96.9%

Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care
Permanency

1773	Does the frequency of visitation with the mother/guardian/kin adequately address the needs of the child/youth to maintain or promote continuity of the relationship? (Check all No responses that apply)	845	246	865	77.5 %	771	209	715	78.7%	790	244	841	76.4%	850	191	782	81.7%
	<i>No, GAL</i>			11				1				6				2	
	<i>No, OOH Provider</i>			4				0				4				1	
	<i>No, child/youth</i>			12				12				22				11	
	<i>No, county</i>			14				3				5				2	
	<i>No, court</i>			37				14				21				6	
	<i>No, mother/guardian/kin</i>			191				188				204				172	
	<i>No, other</i>			15				5				6				12	
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)	406	246	1304	62.3 %	396	165	1134	70.6%	444	202	1229	68.7%	452	181	1190	71.4%
	<i>No, GAL</i>			7				1				5				1	
	<i>No, OOH Provider</i>			0				0				1				2	
	<i>No, child/youth</i>			13				8				9				16	
	<i>No, county</i>			8				3				5				0	
	<i>No, court</i>			26				8				21				15	
	<i>No, father/guardian/kin</i>			207				149				171				157	
	<i>No, other</i>			14				3				7				10	

Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 2

Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

Permanency

	1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
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)	753	85	1118	89.9 %	677	70	948	90.6%	801	71	1003	91.9%	738	68	1017	91.6%
No, GAL			2			0				1				2		
No, OOH Provider			10			6				7				12		
No, child/youth			14			8				11				8		
No, county			9			14				13				4		
No, court			5			2				1				1		
No, other			27			22				16				13		
No, parent/guardian/kin			18			21				22				24		
No, sibling			20			13				12				17		

Item 14: Preserving Connections

Court

1705 Were these ICWA requirements met? (Check all that apply)	115	142	1699	44.7 %	107	170	1418	38.6%	68	159	1648	30.0%	84	171	1568	32.9%
No "active efforts" findings			1			8				7				15		
No "beyond reasonable doubt" lang. in term. order			2			5				0				3		
No court order determ. if ICWA does NOT apply			35			55				53				55		
No docum. of inquiry of Native American heritage			37			43				24				10		
No notification sent to all identified tribes/BIA			36			38				48				51		
No response from tribe/BIA			36			57				37				77		
No, ICWA order of preference for placement not met			1			1				1				1		
No, new info obtained during FF portion of review			12			8				14				6		
No, other			7			7				5				7		
No, tribe not notified of hearings			0			4				1				7		

Case Planning/Services

1728 Is the department making concerted efforts to maintain the child/youth's connections during the review period?	1944	4	8	99.8 %	1662	8	25	99.5%	1844	4	28	99.8%	1799	3	21	99.8%
--	------	---	---	--------	------	---	----	-------	------	---	----	-------	------	---	----	-------

Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents

Statewide Child Welfare
Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews
Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Permanency Outcome 2

Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents
Permanency

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1777	Did the agency promote and support a positive and nurturing relationship between the child/youth and his/her parents? (Check all that apply)	1012	76	868	93.0 %	914	55	726	94.3%	976	88	810	91.7%	1038	65	720	94.1%
	Yes, encouraged attend. at doctors' appointments			115				93				111				110	
	Yes, encouraged attend. at extra-curricular activ.			56				32				48				52	
	Yes, encouraged foster parents to become mentors			83				57				65				76	
	Yes, facil. contact w/parents not in close proxim.			68				80				65				80	
	Yes, facilitated contact w/incarcerated parents			14				32				7				34	
	Yes, other			107				87				88				107	
	Yes, provid. therap. situations to strengthen rel.			789				727				770				800	
	Yes, provided transportation/funds			273				257				266				319	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 17: Needs/Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents

Case Planning/Services

		<u>1st Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>2nd Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>3rd Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>4th Quarter SFY 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>
1721	Does the Family Services Plan treatment plan document services that are directed at the areas of need identified through assessment?	1659	297	0	84.8 %	1419	276	0	83.7%	1562	313	1	83.3%	1580	243	0	86.7%
	No		235				213				258				190		
	No treatment plan developed		5				4				14				2		
	No, all task time frames expired		57				64				48				51		
1722	Were all required parties addressed in the treatment plan? (Check all No responses that apply)	1588	368	0	81.2 %	1359	336	0	80.2%	1478	395	2	78.9%	1489	334	0	81.7%
	No treatment plan developed		5				4				13				2		
	No, all task time frames expired		56				66				51				52		
	No, child/youth		46				51				66				41		
	No, county		29				23				15				18		
	No, father/guardian		27				29				46				34		
	No, mother/guardian		17				9				11				18		
	No, other		1				0				5				2		
	No, out of home provider		143				147				149				141		
	No, some task time frames expired		115				90				139				107		
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)	1662	293	1	85.0 %	1398	297	0	82.5%	1610	264	1	85.9%	1519	304	0	83.3%
	No treatment plan developed		5				4				14				2		
	No, all task time frames expired		56				66				44				53		
	No, measurable		167				182				161				218		
	No, realistic		4				5				11				20		
	No, specific		147				116				132				143		
	No, time-limited		2				3				3				5		

Item 17: Needs/Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 17: Needs/Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents

Case Planning/Services

	1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1724 Does the most recent 90-day review/Court report in Trails meet Volume 7 requirements? (Check all No responses that apply)	1502	453	1	76.8 %	1207	488	0	71.2%	1426	446	3	76.2%	1410	412	1	77.4%
<i>No approval</i>			65			78				52				80		
<i>No current 90-day review</i>			35			58				46				37		
<i>No diligent search</i>			222			208				204				144		
<i>No, barriers to progress</i>			48			40				29				19		
<i>No, caregiver/kin provider services and progress</i>			7			9				6				11		
<i>No, child/youth services and progress</i>			91			89				67				64		
<i>No, child/youth services appropriateness</i>			5			11				10				12		
<i>No, child/youth's safety</i>			18			12				13				17		
<i>No, need for add./diff. svcs. and how provided</i>			3			4				6				10		
<i>No, parent services and progress</i>			39			50				38				23		
<i>No, parent(s)/guardian(s) services appropriateness</i>			3			7				4				3		
<i>No, permanency goal</i>			39			37				51				41		
<i>No, permanency goal date</i>			32			32				35				41		
<i>No, task time frames</i>			92			82				86				110		
<i>No, timely provision of mandated services</i>			2			0				4				2		

Health

1749 If the goal is/was return home during the review period and substance abuse issues have been identified for the parent(s)/guardian(s), what are the substances of use? (Check all that apply)																
<i>Alcohol</i>			242			226				252				259		
<i>CNS Depressants</i>			10			16				16				16		
<i>CNS Stimulants</i>			5			6				4				16		
<i>Cocaine/Crack</i>			108			87				91				104		
<i>Heroin</i>			37			10				33				26		
<i>Marijuana</i>			221			167				192				229		
<i>Methamphetamine</i>			224			175				222				243		
<i>Other</i>			21			36				20				45		
<i>Other Opiates</i>			49			41				55				56		

Statewide Child Welfare
Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews
Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 1

Health

		<u>1st Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>2nd Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>3rd Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>4th Quarter SFY 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>
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)	323	173	1460	65.1 %	282	166	1247	62.9%	270	225	1380	54.5%	308	214	1301	59.0%
	<i>No available services</i>			0			8				2				2		
	<i>No received provider report</i>			1			3				0				0		
	<i>No referral by county</i>			3			2				6				2		
	<i>No sufficient services</i>			1			0				3				0		
	<i>No, delays of 2 + weeks</i>			1			2				16				1		
	<i>No, parent/guardian refused services</i>			153			137				188				189		
	<i>Unable to determine - outside services</i>			17			14				25				22		
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)																
	<i>Alcohol</i>			76			58				60				74		
	<i>CNS Depressants</i>			3			0				3				2		
	<i>CNS Stimulants</i>			5			1				2				0		
	<i>Cocaine/Crack</i>			10			13				12				11		
	<i>Heroin</i>			4			3				9				2		
	<i>Marijuana</i>			134			125				116				134		
	<i>Methamphetamine</i>			13			17				17				20		
	<i>Other</i>			15			14				17				18		
	<i>Other Opiates</i>			1			7				4				8		
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)	113	33	1810	77.4 %	117	32	1546	78.5%	105	28	1742	78.9%	119	23	1681	83.8%
	<i>No available services</i>			0			4				0				1		
	<i>No received provider report</i>			2			0				0				0		
	<i>No referral by county</i>			7			6				6				5		
	<i>No sufficient services</i>			0			1				2				1		
	<i>No, child/youth refused services</i>			16			18				9				7		
	<i>No, delays of 2 + weeks</i>			5			5				6				7		
	<i>Unable to determine - outside services</i>			6			1				7				3		

Item 18: Child/Family Involvement in Case Planning

Statewide Child Welfare
Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews
Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 18: Child/Family Involvement in Case Planning
Case Planning/Services

1713	Was the out-of-home provider engaged in case planning, during the review period? (Check all responses that apply)	1920	13	23	99.3 %	1661	6	28	99.6%	1843	0	33	100.0%	1785	9	29	99.5%
	No	13				5				0				10			
1715	Was the child/youth engaged in case planning, during the review period?	985	1	970	99.9 %	855	2	838	99.8%	945	1	928	99.9%	882	0	941	100.0%
	No	1				0				0				0			
	No, efforts made but refused	1				1				1				0			
1717	Was the mother/guardian/kin engaged in case planning, during the review period?	1117	70	769	94.1 %	1007	65	623	93.9%	1047	92	736	91.9%	1051	98	674	91.5%
	No	30				34				41				40			
	No, efforts made but refused	41				31				51				57			
Item 18: Child/Family Involvement in Case Planning																	
1719	Was the father/guardian/kin engaged in case planning during the review period?	677	130	1149	83.9 %	600	125	970	82.8%	656	158	1061	80.6%	667	138	1018	82.9%
	No	54				42				68				55			
	No, efforts made but refused	76				83				90				83			

Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

Statewide Child Welfare
Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews
Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 19: Worker Visits with Child
Permanency

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 15 10 16 10

2 7 23 10 13

3 25 30 34 23

4 52 79 61 84

5 492 523 477 533

6 1,203 930 1012 948

7 84 55 209 159

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)

0 2 0 2 1

1 14 14 17 14

2 14 22 13 17

3 31 54 52 31

4 100 141 100 131

5 543 531 530 561

6 1,092 846 925 869

7 82 42 178 146

Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child?

In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?

1st Quarter SFY 2013

Yes No NA %

2nd Quarter SFY 2013

Yes No NA %

3rd Quarter SFY 2013

Yes No NA %

4th Quarter SFY 2013

Yes No NA %

98.1%

97.4%

97.5%

98.0%

1711 180

91.1%



1469 180

89.1%



1627 192

89.4%



1610 160

91.0%



Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 19: Worker Visits with Child Permanency

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)

	1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1		11			9				11				7			
2		7			7				10				6			
3		6			9				17				7			
4		5			8				8				7			
5		21			7				17				5			
6		58			37				38				44			
7		10			4				14				7			

1766 How many months did the worker of either the sending or receiving state make face-to-face contact with the child/youth during the review period, for a child/youth placed outside the state? (Answer for ICPC cases only)

0		9			5				14				7			
1		14			9				8				12			
2		8			13				20				7			
3		13			17				24				9			
4		19			11				14				18			
5		22			12				13				5			
6		21			12				20				20			
7		11			1				2				4			

Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child?

2.9% 

In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?

64	55	53.8%	41	40	50.6%	51	64	44.3%	44	39	53.0%	
----	----	-------	----	----	-------	----	----	-------	----	----	-------	---

1767 Did the frequency of contact with the child/youth in his/her place of residence occur according to Volume 7?

1802	148	6	92.4 %		1553	130	12	92.3%		1698	175	3	90.7%		1645	173	5	90.5%	
------	-----	---	--------	---	------	-----	----	-------	---	------	-----	---	-------	---	------	-----	---	-------	---

Item 19: Worker Visits with Child Permanency

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)

1485	464	7	76.2 %		1280	402	13	76.1%		1418	452	5	75.8%		1434	382	7	79.0%	
------	-----	---	--------	---	------	-----	----	-------	---	------	-----	---	-------	---	------	-----	---	-------	---

No assessment of safety

317	269	301	277
-----	-----	-----	-----

No, outside presence of provider

327	285	286	248
-----	-----	-----	-----

Statewide Child Welfare
Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews
Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents
Permanency

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1769	Did the frequency of contact with the mother/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	578	300	1078	65.8 %	484	310	901	61.0%	488	341	1045	58.9%	544	319	960	63.0%
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?	761	93	1102	89.1 %	672	102	921	86.8%	688	122	1065	84.9%	763	76	984	90.9%
1771	Did the frequency of contact with the father/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	210	187	1559	52.9 %	218	147	1330	59.7%	210	221	1444	48.7%	191	204	1428	48.4%
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?	334	46	1576	87.9 %	315	35	1345	90.0%	346	60	1469	85.2%	320	51	1452	86.3%

Statewide Child Welfare
Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews
Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 2

Item 21: Educational Needs of Child
Education

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1737	Is the child/youth's education/school record in the case file? (Check all No responses that apply)	1049	349	558	75.0 %	949	306	440	75.6%	1078	272	526	79.9%	1039	273	511	79.2%
	<i>No GED/Diploma</i>			26			17				6				17		
	<i>No address of current school</i>			36			62				33				49		
	<i>No credit count</i>			28			26				24				15		
	<i>No current IEP</i>			89			92				116				97		
	<i>No current grade reports</i>			260			209				166				153		
	<i>No name of current school</i>			14			13				12				25		
1738	For children aged 3 - 5: Is the child enrolled in Head Start or another early childhood education program?	185	36	1735	83.7 %	129	32	1534	80.1%	175	36	1663	82.9%	158	45	1620	77.8%
	<i>Information not available</i>			3			3				1				3		
	<i>Yes, assessed only</i>			31			12				20				18		
	<i>Yes, enrolled</i>			154			117				155				140		
1739	For youth aged 16 or older: Is the youth on track to graduate and/or complete high school?	420	104	1432	80.2 %	380	110	1205	77.6%	436	93	1346	82.4%	397	114	1312	77.7%
	<i>GED</i>			19			23				13				17		
	<i>GED earned</i>			20			19				14				29		
	<i>Graduated</i>			51			46				42				51		
	<i>Information not available</i>			11			24				12				25		
	<i>No GED</i>			11			10				3				11		
	<i>No, graduate</i>			81			76				78				80		
1740	Was educational stability provided for the child during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply)	976	411	569	70.4 %	750	482	463	60.9%	891	441	544	66.9%	872	414	536	67.8%
	<i>No, changed schools during review period</i>			304			322				311				278		
	<i>No, delays in enrollment</i>			2			1				6				4		
	<i>No, delays in record transfer</i>			3			0				2				1		
	<i>No, initial placement required change in school</i>			157			204				169				174		
	<i>No, other</i>			6			4				11				17		
	<i>No, req. 504 or IEP spec. ed. svcs. were not prov.</i>			4			4				2				3		
	<i>No, schl. distr. refused to provide appropri. svcs.</i>			2			2				5				2		
1741	Were the child/youth's educational needs assessed?	1500	22	434	98.6 %	1314	21	360	98.4%	1409	22	444	98.5%	1341	17	465	98.7%

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 3

Item 22: Physical Health of Child Health

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1742	Is health information in the case file, including name and address of current health care provider(s), known medical problems and current medications? (Check all No responses that apply)	1904	47	5	97.6 %	1644	39	12	97.7%	1827	38	10	98.0%	1781	32	10	98.2%
	No provider address/phone number			48			39				35				32		
	No provider name			41			35				33				26		
	No, medical problems not documented			9			1				3				3		
	No, medications not documented			4			1				5				3		
1743	Did the child/youth receive a medical exam, medical screening, or was a medical exam scheduled within two weeks of initial placement? (Check all No responses that apply) (Initial Review Only)	421	121	1414	77.7 %	438	164	1093	72.8%	434	169	1271	72.0%	464	172	1187	73.0%
	No, Medicaid card			3			3				0				2		
	No, Medicaid provider			1			0				0				0		
	No, late			92			125				130				132		
	No, never occurred			15			32				29				28		
	No, other			12			8				10				12		
	Yes, appointment			73			66				74				85		
	Yes, exam			348			372				361				379		
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)	325	64	1567	83.5 %	368	96	1231	79.3%	374	79	1422	82.6%	420	79	1324	84.2%
	No, Medicaid card			0			0				0				1		
	No, Medicaid provider			0			0				1				0		
	No, late			26			49				41				40		
	No, never occurred			26			46				31				31		
	No, other			12			1				7				9		
	Yes, appointment			18			16				12				29		
	Yes, exam			307			352				362				391		

Item 22: Physical Health of Child

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Well Being Outcome 3

Item 22: Physical Health of Child Health

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1745	Has the child/youth received regular health care, including immunizations, and/or treatment for identified health needs? (Services delivered) (Check all No responses that apply)	1581	364	11	81.3 %	1312	369	14	78.0%	1485	380	11	79.6%	1489	325	9	82.1%
	No statement from medical examiner			220				235				254				193	
	No treatment for identified needs			6				3				5				5	
	No, Medicaid			3				1				1				1	
	No, immunizations			71				71				44				51	
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through			150				132				116				125	
	No, other			8				13				20				15	
1746	Has the child/youth received regular dental care and treatment for identified dental needs? (Services delivered) (Check all No responses that apply)	1294	317	345	80.3 %	1146	257	292	81.7%	1301	262	312	83.2%	1226	280	317	81.4%
	No treatment for identified needs			1				4				5				3	
	No, Medicaid			6				3				8				5	
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through			288				237				231				245	
	No, other			29				17				30				33	

Item 23: Mental Health of Child Health

1747	Were the child/youth's mental health needs assessed?	1584	3	369	99.8 %	1340	15	340	98.9%	1470	7	398	99.5%	1432	4	387	99.7%
1748	Were mental health services provided to meet the child/youth's needs during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply)	983	384	589	71.9 %	829	331	535	71.5%	942	322	611	74.5%	881	317	624	73.5%
	No available services			4				5				1				9	
	No referral by county			4				2				8				1	
	No sufficient services			14				13				9				9	
	No, Medicaid			4				2				5				7	
	No, OOH provider issue			19				23				15				17	
	No, changed MH provider			255				212				212				200	
	No, child refused services			26				36				19				24	
	No, delays of 2 + weeks			107				78				98				76	
	No, mental health systems issue			30				29				47				32	
	No, other			18				8				16				14	
	Unable to determine			1				0				1				13	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Systemic Factors

Item 25: Process to Ensure Each Child Has a Written Case Plan Developed Jointly with Parents

Case Planning/Services

	<u>1st Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>2nd Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>3rd Quarter SFY 2013</u>				<u>4th Quarter SFY 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>
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?	1593	354	9	81.8 %	1313	362	20	78.4%	1487	367	21	80.2%	1517	295	11	83.7%

Item 27: Permanency Hearing Every Twelve Months

Court

1703 If a child has been in care for 12 months or longer, is there a court order in the case file that was signed and dated within the last 12 months that contains reasonable efforts to achieve permanency language, and does not contain "nunc pro tunc" language? (Re-Review Only)	1333	48	575	96.5 %	1050	31	614	97.1%	1200	44	631	96.5%	1121	41	661	96.5%
<i>No reasonable efforts</i>			12			9				8				3		
<i>No signed court order</i>			44			26				42				41		
<i>No, contains "nunc pro tunc" language</i>			0			0				1				0		

Item 29: Process for Foster Parents, Pre-adoptive Parents, and Relative Caregivers to be Notified of, and an Opportunity to be Heard, in Any Review or Hearing Held with Respect to the Child

Due Process

1708 Were all required parties invited to the review and given at least two weeks notice? (Check all that apply)	1747	209	0	89.3 %	1502	193	0	88.6%	1676	199	0	89.4%	1602	221	0	87.9%
<i>No, Attorneys of Record (Court Ordered)</i>			3			1				8				3		
<i>No, GAL</i>			29			26				27				27		
<i>No, OOH Provider</i>			72			42				48				54		
<i>No, Tribe/BIA (if ICWA applies)</i>			12			15				17				26		
<i>No, caseworker</i>			23			26				26				30		
<i>No, child over 12</i>			24			24				14				25		
<i>No, father/guardian</i>			48			60				50				50		
<i>No, mother/guardian</i>			29			15				32				25		
<i>No, not timely</i>			33			29				18				21		

Statewide Child Welfare
Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews
Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Miscellaneous

Miscellaneous
Court

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1701	Is this a court ordered review?	123	1833	0	6.3 %	121	1,574	0	7.1%	119	1756	0	6.3%	101	1722	0	5.5%
1702	Is there a signed removal order that contains best interest or welfare of the child language, and determines if reasonable efforts were made or an emergency justified lack of reasonable efforts, and does not contain "nunc pro tunc" language? (Check all that apply) (Initial Review Only)	527	9	1420	98.3 %	591	16	1088	97.4%	572	28	1274	95.3%	608	24	1191	96.2%
	<i>No best interest</i>		1				3				3				4		
	<i>No reasonable efforts/emergency</i>		7				6				11				8		
	<i>No signed removal order</i>		1				10				16				16		
	<i>No, contains "nunc pro tunc" language</i>		1				1				2				2		
1704	Has the county had authority for placement within the review period? (A Fiscal Sanction may result if the answer is "No.")	1952	4	0	99.8 %	1688	7	0	99.6%	1867	8	1	99.6%	1816	7	0	99.6%
IV-E																	
1706	Has IV-E eligibility been determined within 45 days of removal? (A Fiscal Sanction may result if the answer is "No.") (Initial Review Only)	518	25	1413	95.4 %	580	26	1089	95.7%	586	25	1263	95.9%	608	39	1176	94.0% 
1707	Has a timely IV-E redetermination been completed during the review period? (Re-Review Only)	384	27	1545	93.4 % 	319	8	1368	97.6%	381	23	1472	94.3% 	336	9	1478	97.4%
Permanency																	
1778	Were the previous compliance issues addressed? (Re-Review Only)	578	428	950	57.5 % 	411	370	914	52.6% 	525	411	939	56.1% 	478	407	938	54.0% 

Statewide Child Welfare
Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews
Administrative Review Division

7/1/2012 - 6/30/2013

Miscellaneous

Miscellaneous

Credit Report

		1st Quarter SFY 2013				2nd Quarter SFY 2013				3rd Quarter SFY 2013				4th Quarter SFY 2013			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
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	3	0.0 %	1	0	859	00.0%	1	0	1867	100.0%	15	0	1793	00.0%
	No, GAL			0				0				0				1	
	No, not requested			0				3				1				8	
	No, requested but not received - Equifax			0				0				2				3	
	No, requested but not received - Experian			0				0				4				4	
	No, requested but not received - TransUnion			0				0				2				4	
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	3	0.0 %	0	0	863		2	0	1873	100.0%	1	1	1821	50.0% 
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	3	0.0 %	0	0	863		2	0	1873	100.0%	1	1	1821	50.0% 