Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

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: 4/12/2012

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Safety Outcome 2

Item 4: Risk of Harm

Safety

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		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?	50	2	109	96.2%	52	1	122	98.1%	61	3	120	95.3%	62	1	107	98.4%
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)	45	3	113	93.8%	41	6	128	87.2%	50	1	132	98.0%	47	1	123	97.9%
	No Safety Plan			0				0				0				1	
	No assessment/investigation			0				2				1				0	
	No change in treatment plan			0				0				0				1	
	No placement change			0				0				1				0	
	No, not addressed			1				1				2				0	
	No, other			2				2				0				0	

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placements

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
	Case 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)	158	3	0	98.1%	170	2	3	98.8%	180	1	2	99.4%	170	0	1	100.0%
	No, other			2			3				0				0		
	No, sibling placement issues			3			0				0				0		
	No, unable to determine where child is placed			1			0				0				0		
	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)	29	22	110	56.9% ⚠	35	23	117	60.3% ⚠	31	41	111	43.1% ⚠	17	29	125	37.0% ⚠
	Yes, in line with case goal and planned			22			17				24				11		
	Yes, to meet youth's specific needs and planned			8			18				7				4		
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																
	More than one move			8			8				12				9		
	Other			3			2				1				1		
	Provider abuse or neglect allegations			6			1				2				2		
	Provider quit or closed			0			1				5				2		
	Provider request			13			15				28				12		
	Runaway			7			8				9				6		
	Temporary setting			1			2				6				12		
	Youth's behavior			6			12				23				13		

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
	Permanency																
1760	In the reviewer's opinion, is the primary court ordered permanency goal, at the time of the review, appropriate for this child/youth?	148	12	1	92.5%	170	4	1	97.7%	167	16	0	91.3%	160	10	1	94.1%
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?	16	3	142	84.2%	11	1	163	91.7%	13	8	162	61.9%	17	3	151	85.0%
	No, not completed			2				1				8				3	
	Permanency																
1755	At the time of the review, are reasonable efforts being made to achieve permanency? (Check all No responses that apply)	161	0	0	100.0%	174	0	1	100.0%	182	0	1	100.0%	170	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)	19	49	93	27.9%	26	48	101	35.1%	21	47	115	30.9%	34	56	81	37.8%
	No housing			1				0				0				0	
	No, ICPC			0				2				1				2	
	No, child lack of progress			12				16				15				7	
	No, court delays			0				0				0				1	
	No, other			7				4				5				7	
	No, other potential caregiver lack of progress			0				0				1				1	
	No, parent incarc. or long term treatment program			4				9				7				5	
	No, parent lack of progress			35				43				36				47	
	No, parents whereabouts are unknown			11				3				11				9	
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)	1	3	157	25.0%	7	2	166	77.8%	3	2	178	60.0%	1	1	169	50.0%
	No, child lack of progress			1				0				0				1	
	No, child/youth services appropriateness			1				0				0				0	
	No, lack of community supports			1				0				0				0	
	No, other			1				1				2				0	
	No, other potential caregiver lack of progress			0				1				1				0	
	No, parent lack of progress			1				0				0				0	

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 9: Adoption

Permanency

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1757	For a child/youth with a goal of adoption, is progress being made toward finalizing the adoption? (Check all No responses that apply)	22	27	112	44.9%	40	19	116	67.8%	37	33	113	52.9%	33	22	116	60.0%
	No adoptive home			8			8				9				15		
	No, ICPC			0			1				3				3		
	No, appeal of termination			4			9				4				2		
	No, appropriateness of services			1			0				0				0		
	No, child/youth declined			2			0				4				0		
	No, court delays			0			1				3				2		
	No, lack of effort/inadequate supervision/training			0			0				1				0		
	No, lack of provider support			2			0				0				0		
	No, lack of recruitment			1			0				0				0		
	No, other			11			2				5				0		
	No, placement provider does not support perm. goal			1			0				3				0		
	No, subsidy issues			1			0				3				1		

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement

Case Planning/Services

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1731	For all youth over age 16 years and 60 days, is there a comprehensive ILP that addresses all needs identified from a state-approved assessment? (Check all No responses that apply)	42	10	109	80.8%	35	12	128	74.5%	39	13	131	75.0%	32	13	126	71.1%
	No description or plan of services			2			4				1				2		
	No plan			0			1				3				5		
	No self-sufficiency budget			6			9				3				5		
	No state approved assessment used			0			4				1				2		
	No, all identified needs not addressed			0			5				2				1		
	No, not timely			0			0				0				1		
	No, not updated			1			2				3				1		
	Not all ILP tabs completed			7			1				3				0		
	Not developed with youth			0			0				0				1		
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)	48	4	109	92.3%	39	8	128	83.0%	47	4	132	92.2%	40	3	128	93.0%
	No referral for Chafee services			1			1				1				2		
	No, lack of resources			3			0				0				0		
	No, wait list			1			1				1				0		
	No, youth refused services			0			5				1				1		
1735	Is there a comprehensive, youth-driven Emancipation Transition Plan (ETP) developed 90 business days before the youth's projected permanency date? (Check all No responses that apply) (Check only "No plan" if there is not ETP plan)	3	4	154	42.9%	4	3	168	57.1%	5	2	176	71.4%	1	2	168	33.3%
	No plan			3			3				2				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)	4	1	156	80.0%	5	2	168	71.4%	4	1	178	80.0%	5	0	166	100.0%
	No Birth Certificate			0			0				1				1		
	No Health Passport/medical records			0			1				0				0		
	No Social Security card			1			0				1				0		
	No State ID/driver's license			1			1				1				0		
	No educational records			0			0				1				0		

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement

Permanency

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1759	For a child/youth a permanency goal of Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement, is it documented that all other more permanent goals have been considered and appropriately ruled out? (Check all No responses that apply)	41	5	115	89.1%	35	5	135	87.5%	35	9	139	79.5%	35	2	134	94.6%
	No documentation			0				1				7				2	
	No, documented reasons not appropriate			1				0				0				0	
	No, not reviewed annually			4				4				2				0	

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Permanency Outcome 2

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
Item 11: Proximity of Placement																	
Case Planning/Services																	
1726	Is the child/youth placed within close proximity to his/her parents or other potential permanent caregiver's home?	88	8	65	91.7%	111	13	51	89.5%	118	7	58	94.4%	110	14	47	88.7%
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?	8	0	153	100.0%	15	0	160	100.0%	8	0	175	100.0%	12	0	159	100.0%
Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care																	
Permanency																	
1773	Does the frequency of visitation with the mother/guardian/kin adequately address the needs of the child/youth to maintain or promote continuity of the relationship? (Check all No responses that apply)	82	12	67	87.2%	81	21	73	79.4%	77	12	94	86.5%	85	18	68	82.5%
	No, GAL			0			0				0				3		
	No, OOH Provider			0			0				0				2		
	No, child/youth			2			3				1				1		
	No, county			1			0				0				1		
	No, court			0			1				0				0		
	No, mother/guardian/kin			10			20				12				13		
	No, other			1			0				0				0		
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)	41	10	110	80.4%	47	13	115	78.3%	41	11	131	78.8%	39	19	113	67.2%
	No, GAL			0			0				0				3		
	No, child/youth			1			1				0				3		
	No, court			0			0				0				1		
	No, father/guardian/kin			8			13				12				13		
	No, other			1			0				0				2		

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Permanency Outcome 2

	4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care																
Permanency																
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)	66	7	88	90.4%	74	7	94	91.4%	55	4	124	93.2%	70	3	98	95.9%
No, GAL			0			0				0				1		
No, OOH Provider			0			0				3				0		
No, child/youth			2			1				1				0		
No, other			3			4				0				0		
No, parent/guardian/kin			4			1				0				2		
No, sibling			0			1				0				1		
Item 14: Preserving Connections																
Court																
1705 Were these ICWA requirements met? (Check all that apply)	8	2	151	80.0%	0	12	163	0.0%	9	5	169	64.3%	6	5	160	54.5%
No "active efforts" findings			0			0				0				1		
No court order determ. if ICWA does NOT apply			1			2				1				2		
No docum. of inquiry of Native American heritage			1			1				1				1		
No notification sent to all identified tribes/BIA			0			7				2				1		
No response from tribe/BIA			1			3				3				0		
No, new info obtained during FF portion of review			0			0				0				1		
Case Planning/Services																
1728 Is the department making concerted efforts to maintain the child/youth's connections during the review period?	161	0	0	100.0%	173	0	2	100.0%	182	0	1	100.0%	168	2	1	98.8%
Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents																
Permanency																
1777 Did the agency promote and support a positive and nurturing relationship between the child/youth and his/her parents? (Check all that apply)	75	4	82	94.9%	95	2	78	97.9%	72	3	108	96.0%	102	0	69	100.0%
Yes, encouraged attend. at doctors' appointments			5			13				3				5		
Yes, encouraged attend. at extra-curricular activ.			4			5				0				3		
Yes, encouraged foster parents to become mentors			7			4				2				4		
Yes, facil. contact w/parents not in close proxim.			10			9				1				3		
Yes, facilitated contact w/incarcerated parents			0			2				5				2		
Yes, other			4			4				2				4		
Yes, provid. therap. situations to strengthen rel.			60			82				68				84		
Yes, provided transportation/funds			4			7				9				9		

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Well Being Outcome 1

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

Case Planning/Services

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1721	Does the Family Services Plan treatment plan document services that are directed at the areas of need identified through assessment?	133	28	0	82.6%	149	25	1	85.6%	153	30	0	83.6%	146	25	0	85.4%
	No		25				20				14				21		
	No treatment plan developed		1				0				0				0		
	No, all task time frames expired		2				6				16				3		
1722	Were all required parties addressed in the treatment plan? (Check all No responses that apply)	144	16	1	90.0%	146	29	0	83.4%	145	38	0	79.2%	144	27	0	84.2%
	No treatment plan developed		1				0				0				0		
	No, all task time frames expired		2				6				15				4		
	No, child/youth		3				3				2				4		
	No, county		5				0				0				2		
	No, father/guardian		0				0				0				1		
	No, mother/guardian		2				0				0				1		
	No, out of home provider		6				9				16				12		
	No, some task time frames expired		5				14				13				10		
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)	131	30	0	81.4%	159	16	0	90.9%	152	31	0	83.1%	158	13	0	92.4%
	No treatment plan developed																
	No, all task time frames expired		2				6				16				3		
	No, measurable		24				8				3				7		
	No, realistic		1				1				1				0		
	No, specific		26				5				13				3		

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Well Being Outcome 1

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

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
Case Planning/Services																	
1724	Does the most recent 90-day review/Court report in Trails meet Volume 7 requirements? (Check all No responses that apply)	112	49	0	69.6%	127	48	0	72.6%	148	35	0	80.9%	136	35	0	79.5%
	No approval		10				6				8				3		
	No current 90-day review		1				1				3				1		
	No diligent search		32				25				9				24		
	No, barriers to progress		2				1				3				1		
	No, caregiver/kin provider services and progress		0				0				1				0		
	No, child/youth services and progress		4				14				10				1		
	No, child/youth services appropriateness		4				9				1				0		
	No, child/youth's safety		4				5				1				0		
	No, parent services and progress		1				4				2				3		
	No, parent(s)/guardian(s) services appropriateness		2				0				0				1		
	No, permanency goal		4				4				1				3		
	No, permanency goal date		4				2				5				2		
	No, task time frames		13				7				7				5		
Health																	
1749	If the goal is/was return home during the review period and substance abuse issues have been identified for the parent(s)/guardian(s), what are the substances of use? (Check all that apply)																
	Alcohol		17				11				14				20		
	CNS Depressants		2				0				0				0		
	CNS Stimulants		1				2				0				4		
	Cocaine/Crack		11				13				12				5		
	Marijuana		15				18				11				11		
	Methamphetamine		8				8				6				17		
	Other		0				1				1				3		
	Other Opiates		3				1				6				1		

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Well Being Outcome 1

Health

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1750	If the goal is/was return home during the review period and substance abuse issues have been identified for the parent(s)/guardian(s), were substance abuse treatment services provided to the parent(s)/guardian(s)? (Check all No responses that apply)	30	10	121	75.0%	22	13	140	62.9%	24	5	154	82.8%	29	7	135	80.6%
	No available services			0			0				0				2		
	No sufficient services			0			1				0				0		
	No, parent/guardian refused services			8			10				4				7		
	Unable to determine - outside services			2			2				0				0		
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			2			7				3				5		
	CNS Depressants			1			0				0				1		
	CNS Stimulants			0			2				2				0		
	Cocaine/Crack			0			4				2				1		
	Marijuana			8			8				12				7		
	Methamphetamine			1			2				0				1		
	Other			0			2				1				1		
	Other Opiates			0			0				0				1		
1752	If substances abuse issues have been identified during the review period for the child/youth, were substance abuse treatment services provided to the child/youth? (Check all No responses that apply)	8	1	152	88.9%	10	0	165	100.0%	7	5	171	58.3%	9	1	160	90.0%
	No available services			0			0				0				1		
	No referral by county			1			0				1				0		
	No sufficient services			0			0				1				0		
	No, child/youth refused services			0			0				1				0		
	Unable to determine - outside services			0			0				2				0		

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 18: Child/Family Involvement in Case Planning

Case Planning/Services

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1713	Was the out-of-home provider engaged in case planning, during the review period? (Check all responses that apply)	158	2	1	98.8%	173	0	2	100.0%	181	0	2	100.0%	170	0	1	100.0%
	No			2			0				0				0		
1715	Was the child/youth engaged in case planning, during the review period?	90	0	71	100.0%	92	0	83	100.0%	102	0	81	100.0%	90	0	81	100.0%
1717	Was the mother/guardian/kin engaged in case planning, during the review period?	93	1	67	98.9%	115	3	57	97.5%	102	3	78	97.1%	113	1	57	99.1%
	No			1			0				0				0		
	No, efforts made but refused			1			3				3				0		
1719	Was the father/guardian/kin engaged in case planning during the review period?	52	3	106	94.5%	68	9	98	88.3%	60	14	109	81.1%	66	9	96	88.0%
	No			0			2				1				2		
	No, efforts made but refused			3			7				13				7		

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

Permanency

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1763	How many months should the assigned worker have made face-to-face contact with the child/youth during the review period? (Answer for in-state cases only)																
	1			2				3				1				2	
	2			2				1				5				0	
	3			2				0				0				1	
	4			9				1				3				0	
	5			30				62				37				67	
	6			96				97				98				91	
	7			6				5				26				7	
1764	How many months did the assigned worker make face-to-face contact with the child/youth during the review period? (Within the state of Colorado, not an ICPC case)																
	0			1				0				0				0	
	1			4				2				1				2	
	2			1				2				7				1	
	3			2				2				3				2	
	4			14				5				8				5	
	5			39				65				34				62	
	6			82				89				96				90	
	7			4				4				21				6	
	Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child?				95.9%				97.7%				96.9%				%98.7
	In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?													161	7		95.8%

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

Permanency

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
1765	How many months should the worker of either the sending or receiving state make face-to-face contact with the child/youth, placed outside the state, during the review period? (Answer for ICPC cases only)																
	1			1			1				1				0		
	2			2			2				0				0		
	3			0			0				2				0		
	4			1			0				3				0		
	5			3			5				1				3		
	6			7			1				11				3		
	7			6			1				2				0		
1766	How many months did the worker of either the sending or receiving state make face-to-face contact with the child/youth during the review period, for a child/youth placed outside the state? (Answer for ICPC cases only)																
	0			1			1				3				3		
	1			3			3				0				1		
	2			0			0				0				2		
	3			1			0				3				0		
	4			4			4				5				0		
	5			2			1				1				0		
	6			5			0				7				0		
	7			4			0				1				0		
	Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child?																%9.4
	In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?													0	6		.0%
1767	Did the frequency of contact with the child/youth in his/her place of residence occur according to Volume 7?	149	12	0	92.5%	161	13	1	92.5%	172	11	0	94.0%	158	12	1	92.9%

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Well Being Outcome 1

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
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)	106	53	2	66.7%	136	38	1	78.2%	149	34	0	81.4%	150	21	0	87.7%
	No assessment of safety			47			28				29				16		
	No, outside presence of provider			37			23				23				12		
Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents																	
Permanency																	
1769	Did the frequency of contact with the mother/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	56	20	85	73.7%	72	16	87	81.8%	55	17	111	76.4%	64	24	83	72.7%
1770	Was the quality of contacts with the mother/guardian/kin sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child/youth and to promote achievement of case goals?	71	6	84	92.2%	82	6	87	93.2%	60	11	112	84.5%	84	3	84	96.6%
1771	Did the frequency of contact with the father/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	25	10	126	71.4%	33	8	134	80.5%	24	11	148	68.6%	24	12	135	66.7%
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	126	97.1%	39	1	135	97.5%	33	2	148	94.3%	33	3	135	91.7%

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Well Being Outcome 2

Item 21: Educational Needs of Child

Education

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		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)	89	29	43	75.4%	87	25	63	77.7%	111	27	45	80.4%	100	18	53	84.7%
	No GED/Diploma			0			1				4				2		
	No address of current school			7			5				2				3		
	No credit count			4			3				1				2		
	No current IEP			7			6				6				6		
	No current grade reports			19			18				17				9		
1738	For children aged 3 - 5: Is the child enrolled in Head Start or another early childhood education program?	13	1	147	92.9%	16	2	157	88.9%	15	1	167	93.8%	20	0	151	100.0%
	Yes, assessed only			4			3				4				8		
	Yes, enrolled			9			13				11				12		
1739	For youth aged 16 or older: Is the youth on track to graduate and/or complete high school?	36	17	108	67.9%	40	12	123	76.9%	29	23	131	55.8%	40	11	120	78.4%
	GED			2			1				1				5		
	GED earned			3			1				3				0		
	Graduated			10			8				7				3		
	Information not available			1			3				4				3		
	No GED			1			3				2				1		
	No, graduate			14			5				18				8		
1740	Was educational stability provided for the child during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply)	78	40	43	66.1%	61	51	63	54.5%	74	56	53	56.9%	67	48	56	58.3%
	No, CW agency did not advocate			1			0				0				0		
	No, changed schools during review period			30			31				48				27		
	No, initial placement required change in school			12			26				14				27		
	No, other			1			0				0				0		
	No, req. 504 or IEP spec. ed. svcs. were not prov.			0			1				0				0		
1741	Were the child/youth's educational needs assessed?	130	4	27	97.0%	133	1	41	99.3%	149	2	32	98.7%	143	1	27	99.3%

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Well Being Outcome 3

Item 22: Physical Health of Child Health

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		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)	158	3	0	98.1%	170	3	2	98.3%	176	6	1	96.7%	164	6	1	96.5%
	No provider address/phone number			3			4				5				5		
	No provider name			2			2				5				7		
	No, medical problems not documented			1			0				0				0		
1743	Did the child/youth receive a medical exam, medical screening, or was a medical exam scheduled within two weeks of initial placement? (Check all No responses that apply) (Initial Review Only)	34	6	121	85.0%	57	8	110	87.7%	41	7	135	85.4%	51	12	108	81.0%
	No, Medicaid card			0			0				1				2		
	No, late			6			8				2				8		
	No, never occurred			1			0				3				2		
	No, other			0			0				2				2		
	Yes, appointment			1			16				12				13		
	Yes, exam			32			42				29				38		
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)	24	4	133	85.7%	38	8	129	82.6%	30	5	148	85.7%	42	8	121	84.0%
	No, Medicaid card			0			0				0				1		
	No, late			4			8				2				2		
	No, never occurred			0			0				2				2		
	No, other			0			0				1				5		
	Yes, appointment			0			2				3				1		
	Yes, exam			23			37				27				40		

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Well Being Outcome 3

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
Item 22: Physical Health of Child																	
Health																	
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)	124	36	1	77.5%	135	38	2	78.0%	141	41	1	77.5%	142	27	2	84.0%
	No statement from medical examiner		26				29				26				18		
	No, Medicaid		1				0				1				1		
	No, immunizations		5				3				2				1		
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through		16				10				16				6		
	No, other		0				0				0				2		
1746	Has the child/youth received regular dental care and treatment for identified dental needs? (Services delivered) (Check all No responses that apply)	103	34	24	75.2%	117	21	37	84.8%	119	32	32	78.8%	114	27	30	80.9%
	No treatment for identified needs		1				0				0				0		
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through		29				19				31				14		
	No, other		5				2				1				13		
Item 23: Mental Health of Child																	
Health																	
1747	Were the child/youth's mental health needs assessed?	127	0	34	100.0%	133	0	42	100.0%	149	2	32	98.7%	140	0	31	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)	95	24	42	79.8%	90	27	58	76.9%	94	43	46	68.6%	95	29	47	76.6%
	No available services		2				0				0				0		
	No referral by county		1				0				0				0		
	No sufficient services		2				1				3				2		
	No, Medicaid		1				0				0				0		
	No, OOH provider issue		1				2				1				3		
	No, changed MH provider		13				19				33				18		
	No, child refused services		2				3				4				1		
	No, delays of 2 + weeks		9				5				4				3		
	No, mental health systems issue		8				3				4				2		
	No, other		3				2				1				2		

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Systemic Factors

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
Item 25: Process to Ensure Each Child Has a Written Case Plan Developed Jointly with Parents																	
Case Planning/Services																	
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?	140	19	2	88.1%	155	16	4	90.6%	153	28	2	84.5%	144	26	1	84.7%
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)	104	12	45	89.7%	99	9	67	91.7%	108	18	57	85.7%	85	12	74	87.6%
	No reasonable efforts			2			5				2				4		
	No signed court order			12			4				18				12		
	No, contains "nunc pro tunc" language			1			0				0				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)	137	24	0	85.1%	156	19	0	89.1%	168	15	0	91.8%	159	11	1	93.5%
	No, Attorneys of Record (Court Ordered)			2			0				1				1		
	No, GAL			2			1				0				3		
	No, OOH Provider			7			4				5				2		
	No, Tribe/BIA (if ICWA applies)			2			0				0				1		
	No, caseworker			4			5				1				0		
	No, child over 12			1			1				0				0		
	No, father/guardian			5			4				5				2		
	No, mother/guardian			3			5				3				0		
	No, not timely			2			1				2				3		

Arapahoe

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

4/1/2011 - 3/31/2012

Miscellaneous

		4th Quarter SFY 2				1st Quarter SFY 3				2nd Quarter SFY 3				3rd Quarter SFY 3			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
Miscellaneous																	
Court																	
1701	Is this a court ordered review?	75	86	0	46.6%	62	113	0	35.4%	93	90	0	50.8%	71	100	0	41.5%
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)	40	0	121	100.0%	66	1	108	98.5%	49	0	134	100.0%	63	1	107	98.4%
	No best interest			0			0				0				1		
	No reasonable efforts/emergency			0			1				0				0		
	No signed removal order			0			1				0				0		
1704	Has the county had authority for placement within the review period? (A Fiscal Sanction may result if the answer is "No.")	161	0	0	100.0%	175	0	0	100.0%	183	0	0	100.0%	170	1	0	99.4%
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)	37	3	121	92.5%	62	5	108	92.5%	51	1	131	98.1%	62	3	106	95.4%
1707	Has a timely IV-E redetermination been completed during the review period? (Re-Review Only)	14	7	140	66.7%	25	2	148	92.6%	30	7	146	81.1%	13	2	156	86.7%
Permanency																	
1778	Were the previous compliance issues addressed? (Re-Review Only)	49	46	66	51.6%	51	26	98	66.2%	66	33	83	66.7%	61	24	86	71.8%