Statewide DYC - Community Placement

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011

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: 7/27/2011

Statewide DYC - Community Placement

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011

reviewDate quarter3

Safety Outcome 2

Item 4: Risk of Harm

Safety

		1st Quarter SFY 2011				2nd Quarter SFY 2011				3rd Quarter SFY 2011				4th Quarter SFY 2011			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
8506	If any new allegations/incidents of abuse or neglect identified during the review period, were all of these reported/documented in Trails as new referrals?	25	1	210	96.2 %	21	2	174	91.3%	26	5	185	83.9%	40	1	192	97.6%
8507	If any new safety concerns were received regarding this client, were the safety needs of the client adequately addressed during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply)	40	0	196	100.0 %	33	1	163	97.1%	39	1	176	97.5%	66	1	166	98.5%

Statewide DYC - Community Placement

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011

reviewDate	quarter3	1st Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%	2nd Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%	3rd Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%	4th Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%
Permanency Outcome 1																	
Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placements																	
Case Planning/Services																	
8518 At the time of the review, is the client placed in the most appropriate setting to meet his/her individual needs? (Check all No responses that apply)		205	1	30	99.5 %	176	0	21	00.0%	188	2	26	98.9%	203	0	30	00.0%
No, client's needs not addressed/met				1				0				1				0	
No, cultural				0				0				1				0	
Permanency																	
8538 If the client experienced one or more moves during the review period, were all of the placement changes planned by the Division in an effort to achieve the client's case goals or to meet the needs of the client? (Check "Yes, in line with case goal + planned" if both "Yes" answers are appropriate)		42	21	173	66.7 %	28	18	151	60.9%	40	21	155	65.6%	41	31	161	56.9%
Yes, in line with case goal and planned				41				26				40				37	
Yes, to meet client's specific needs and planned				1				2				0				4	
8539 If the client experienced one or more moves that were not planned by the Division in an effort to achieve the client's case goals or to meet the needs of the client, what was/were the reason(s) for the move(s) during the review period? (Check all that apply)																	
Client-on-client abuse				1				0				0				0	
Escape				11				12				12				21	
More than one move				5				1				4				8	
Other				5				7				8				7	
Provider abuse or neglect allegations				0				0				0				1	
Provider quit or closed				2				0				0				2	
Provider request				4				0				1				1	
Temporary setting				6				5				9				15	
Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child																	
Permanency																	
8542 In the reviewer's opinion, is the primary permanency goal, at the time of the review, appropriate for this client?		221	12	3	94.8 %	188	8	1	95.9%	208	8	0	96.3%	223	10	0	95.7%
8543 If, in the reviewer's opinion, the permanency goal is not appropriate at the time of the review, what should the appropriate permanency goal be?																	
Adoption				0				0				0				1	
All options have not been sufficiently explored				1				1				0				1	
OPPLA - Emancipation				5				6				7				8	
OPPLA - LTFC				0				0				1				0	
Relative Custody or Legal Guardianship				3				0				1				1	
Return Home				3				1				1				0	

Statewide DYC - Community Placement

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011

reviewDate	quarter3	1st Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%	2nd Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%	3rd Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%	4th Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%
Permanency Outcome 1																	
Permanency																	
8540	For clients with a permanency goal of return home, is progress being made toward achieving the goal? (Check all No responses that apply)	88	38	110	69.8 %	89	37	71	70.6%	84	43	89	66.1%	98	40	95	71.0%
	No, ICJ			0				0				1				0	
	No, client lack of progress			23				25				24				21	
	No, client services appropriateness			0				0				3				0	
	No, inadequate monthly parent contact			20				15				18				16	
	No, other			0				1				4				2	
	No, other potential caregiver lack of progress			0				0				1				0	
	No, parent lack of progress			8				5				3				7	
	No, parent(s)/guardian(s) services appropriateness			0				0				1				0	
8541	For clients with a permanency goal of permanent placement with a relative/non-relative through legal guardianship/permanent custody, is progress being made toward achieving the goal? (Check all No responses that apply)	13	4	219	76.5 %	10	4	183	71.4%	8	3	205	72.7%	8	8	217	50.0%
	No, client lack of progress			2				4				3				5	
	No, client services appropriateness			1				0				0				0	
	No, other			2				0				0				4	
Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement																	
Case Planning/Services																	
8522	Is the client, age 16 years + 60 days or older, receiving all the services identified in the assessment and the ILP? (Check all No responses that apply)	204	12	20	94.4 %	161	5	31	97.0%	186	8	22	95.9%	182	13	38	93.3%
	No, client refused services			0				1				0				1	
	No, lack of resources			0				0				0				4	
	No, provider issues			6				3				8				7	
8524	Is there a comprehensive, client-driven Emancipation Transition Plan (ETP) that was developed 90 business days before the end of the client's commitment? (Check all No responses that apply) (Use only "No Plan" if there is no ETP)	5	16	215	23.8 %	2	10	185	16.7%	6	10	200	37.5%	5	11	217	31.3%
	No plan			16				10				10				11	
	No signature			1				0				0				0	

Statewide DYC - Community Placement

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement

Case Planning/Services

	reviewDate	quarter3	1st Quarter SFY 2011				2nd Quarter SFY 2011				3rd Quarter SFY 2011				4th Quarter SFY 2011			
			Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
8525	Have all vital documents been obtained for clients with an OPPLA goal 90 business days before the end of the client's commitment?		16	2	218	88.9 %	9	3	185	75.0%	9	1	206	90.0%	11	2	220	84.6%
	No Birth Certificate				1				0				1				1	
	No Social Security card				1				0				1				1	
	No State ID/driver's license				2				3				0				1	
	No educational records				0				0				0				1	
	No medical/dental records				1				0				0				0	

Statewide DYC - Community Placement

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011

Permanency Outcome 2

reviewDate	quarter3	1st Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%	2nd Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%	3rd Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%	4th Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%
Item 11: Proximity of Placement																	
Case Planning/Services																	
8516	Is the client placed within close proximity to his/her parents or other potential permanent caregiver's home?	85	63	88	57.4 %	84	52	61	61.8%	83	42	91	66.4%	97	36	100	72.9%
Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care																	
Permanency																	
8552	Does the frequency of visitation with the mother/guardian/kin adequately address the needs of the client to maintain or promote continuity of the relationship? (Check all No responses that apply)	159	15	62	91.4 %	149	12	36	92.5%	167	13	36	92.8%	155	13	65	92.3%
	No, Division			0				1				1				0	
	No, OOH Provider			0				0				1				0	
	No, client			0				2				2				0	
	No, mother/guardian/kin			13				10				11				13	
	No, other			2				0				2				0	
8553	Does the frequency of visitation with the father/guardian/kin adequately address the needs of the client to maintain or promote continuity of the relationship? (Check all No responses that apply)	87	9	140	90.6 %	83	16	98	83.8%	91	12	113	88.3%	88	15	130	85.4%
	No, Division			0				0				1				1	
	No, OOH Provider			0				0				1				0	
	No, client			0				1				1				0	
	No, father/guardian/kin			9				13				10				14	
	No, other			0				2				2				1	
Miscellaneous																	
8554	Does the frequency of visitation with the sibling(s) adequately address the needs of the client to maintain or promote continuity of the relationship(s)? (Check all No reponses that apply)	129	7	100	94.9 %	109	10	78	91.6%	131	13	72	91.0%	123	16	94	88.5%
	No, Division			0				1				1				2	
	No, OOH Provider			0				0				1				0	
	No, client			0				1				1				2	
	No, other			1				4				3				5	
	No, parent/guardian/kin			3				4				7				8	
	No, sibling			3				1				3				2	

Statewide DYC - Community Placement

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011

Permanency Outcome 2

Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents

Case Planning/Services

	reviewDate	quarter3	1st Quarter SFY 2011				2nd Quarter SFY 2011				3rd Quarter SFY 2011				4th Quarter SFY 2011			
			Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
8517	If the client 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?		60	1	175	98.4 %	49	2	146	96.1%	42	1	173	97.7%	35	1	197	97.2%

Statewide DYC - Community Placement

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011

Well Being Outcome 1

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

reviewDate	quarter3	1st Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%	2nd Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%	3rd Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%	4th Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%
Case Planning/Services																	
8520	Does the DCP/Parole Plan document services directed at the areas of need identified through assessment?	170	65	1	72.3 %	141	56	0	71.6%	173	43	0	80.1%	188	45	0	80.7%
	No DCP developed			1				0				2				1	
	No, IL not addressed			47				45				33				30	
	No, all task time frames expired			10				9				6				11	
	No, some task time frames expired			12				7				5				2	
8521	Does the DCP/Parole Plan include clear expectations of all parties in order to achieve the permanency goal? (Check all No responses that apply)	188	48	0	79.7 %	163	34	0	82.7%	194	22	0	89.8%	209	24	0	89.7%
	No DCP/Parole Plan developed			1				0				2				1	
	No, Division			26				19				12				9	
	No, all task time frames expired			10				9				6				11	
	No, client			1				1				4				1	
	No, father/guardian			11				14				4				4	
	No, mother/guardian			22				16				11				7	
	No, provider			31				20				15				9	
Health																	
8536	If substance abuse issues have been identified during the review period for the client, what are the substances of use? (Check all that apply)																
	Alcohol			118				95				96				97	
	CNS Depressants			3				4				2				4	
	CNS Stimulants/Amphetamine			3				2				3				1	
	Cocaine/Crack			21				13				14				15	
	Heroin			0				1				1				2	
	Marijuana			160				129				136				154	
	Methamphetamine			10				12				19				20	
	Other			17				8				16				12	
	Other Opiates			1				2				7				2	
8537	If substance abuse issues have been identified during the review period for the client, were substance abuse treatment services provided to the client? (Check all No responses that apply)	164	10	62	94.3 %	138	2	57	98.6%	132	14	70	90.4%	161	11	61	93.6%
	No available services			0				0				1				0	
	No sufficient services			0				0				1				1	
	No, client refused services			1				1				2				4	
	No, delays of 2 + weeks			9				1				12				7	

Statewide DYC - Community Placement

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 18: Child/Family Involvement in Case Planning

Case Planning/Services

	reviewDate / quarter3	1st Quarter SFY 2011				2nd Quarter SFY 2011				3rd Quarter SFY 2011				4th Quarter SFY 2011			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
8508	Was the out-of-home provider engaged in case planning during the review period?	225	0	11	100.0 %	187	0	10	00.0%	202	0	14	100.0%	220	0	13	00.0%
8510	Was the client engaged in case planning during the review period?	234	0	2	100.0 %	196	0	1	00.0%	215	0	1	100.0%	230	0	3	00.0%
8512	Was the mother/guardian/kin engaged in case planning during the review period?	155	35	46	81.6 %	151	19	27	88.8%	160	29	27	84.7%	179	13	41	93.2%
	No			23				10				16				6	
	No, efforts made but refused			12				9				13				7	
8514	Was the father/guardian/kin engaged in case planning during the review period?	69	42	125	62.2 %	75	40	82	65.2%	79	38	99	67.5%	90	30	113	75.0%
	No			28				25				23				20	
	No, efforts made but refused			14				15				15				10	

Statewide DYC - Community Placement

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011

reviewDate	quarter3	1st Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%	2nd Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%	3rd Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%	4th Quarter SFY 2011 Yes	No	NA	%
Well Being Outcome 1																	
Item 19: Worker Visits with Child																	
Permanency																	
8544 How many months should the assigned client manager have made face-to-face contact with the client during the review period?																	
1			5				3				3				3		
2			7				4				6				10		
3			5				16				3				8		
4			15				24				12				21		
5			42				55				63				55		
6			65				76				86				97		
7			94				18				43				35		
8545 How many months did the assigned client manager make face-to-face contact with the client during the review period?																	
0			4				0				0				0		
1			4				4				3				3		
2			7				4				7				10		
3			7				18				3				9		
4			19				25				17				25		
5			43				55				64				52		
6			67				73				79				96		
7			82				17				43				34		
Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child?					96.6%				98.6%				98.8%				99.3%
In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?		213	13		91.4%	183	13		93.4%	205	11		94.9%	220	8		96.5%
Item 19: Worker Visits with Child																	
8546 For a client placed outside the state, is there documentation that the client is visited at least monthly by a professional of either the sending or receivng state??		5	0	231	100.0 %	0	0	197		3	0	213	100.0%	2	0	231	100.0%
8547 Was the quality of contacts made with the client sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the client and to promote achievement of case goals? (Check all No responses that apply)		98	133	5	42.4 %	113	83	1	57.7%	172	44	0	79.6%	198	31	4	86.5%
No assessment of safety			91				48				26				14		
No time alone with client			129				79				37				29		
No, content insufficient			49				30				12				2		

Statewide DYC - Community Placement

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents

Permanency

	reviewDate / quarter3	1st Quarter SFY 2011				2nd Quarter SFY 2011				3rd Quarter SFY 2011				4th Quarter SFY 2011			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
8548	If the client's goal is to return home, did contact with the mother/guardian/kin occur on a monthly basis?	29	87	120	25.0 %	50	55	92	47.6%	56	60	100	48.3%	56	59	118	48.7%
8549	If the client's goal is to return home, was the quality of contacts made with the mother/guardian/kin sufficient to address isses pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the client and to promote achievement of case goals?	75	8	153	90.4 %	88	5	104	94.6%	95	3	118	96.9%	99	5	129	95.2%
8550	If the client's goal is to return home, did contact with the father/guardian/kin occur on a monthly basis?	8	39	189	17.0 %	14	30	153	31.8%	15	29	172	34.1%	20	33	180	37.7%
8551	If the client's goal is to return home, was the quality of contacts made with the father/guardian/kin sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well being of the client and to promote achievement of case goals? (Check all No responses)	24	0	212	100.0 %	31	2	164	93.9%	36	2	178	94.7%	37	2	194	94.9%

Statewide DYC - Community Placement

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011

Well Being Outcome 2

Item 21: Educational Needs of Child

	reviewDate	quarter3	1st Quarter SFY 2011				2nd Quarter SFY 2011				3rd Quarter SFY 2011				4th Quarter SFY 2011			
			Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
Education																		
8526	Is the client's education/school record in the case file? (During the review period) (Check all No responses that apply)		173	36	27	82.8 %	138	35	24	79.8%	133	42	41	76.0%	159	31	43	83.7%
	No GED/Diploma				18				9				14				13	
	No address of current school				2				3				1				1	
	No credit count				3				6				5				3	
	No current IEP				7				9				14				9	
	No current grade reports				15				16				15				8	
	No name of current school				1				2				1				0	
8527	Were the client's educational needs adequately addressed through appropriate educational services during the review period?		204	0	32	100.0 %	169	0	28	00.0%	174	0	42	100.0%	187	0	46	00.0%
8528	Is the client, age 16 or older, on track to graduate from and/or complete high school?		209	9	18	95.9 %	161	16	20	91.0%	186	12	18	93.9%	189	15	29	92.6%
	GED				38				27				40				40	
	GED earned				64				38				54				59	
	Graduated				11				6				9				7	
	Information not available				1				3				0				1	
	No GED				2				3				7				9	
	No, graduate				7				10				6				5	
8529	Was educational stability provided for the client during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply)		154	19	63	89.0 %	139	21	37	86.9%	148	14	54	91.4%	149	24	60	86.1%
	No, changed schools during review period				18				19				13				21	
	No, delays in enrollment				0				1				0				1	
	No, other				1				1				0				3	
	No, req. 504 or IEP spec. ed. svcs. were not prov.				0				1				1				1	
Miscellaneous																		
8556	Were the child/youth's educational needs assessed?		213	0	23	100.0 %	184	0	13	00.0%	188	0	28	100.0%	197	0	36	00.0%

Statewide DYC - Community Placement

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011

reviewDate quarter3

Well Being Outcome 3

Item 22: Physical Health of Child

Health

		1st Quarter SFY 2011				2nd Quarter SFY 2011				3rd Quarter SFY 2011				4th Quarter SFY 2011			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
8530	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)	226	5	5	97.8 %	186	6	5	96.9%	205	1	10	99.5%	202	6	25	97.1%
	No provider address/phone number			4				6				1				6	
	No provider name			4				6				1				5	
	No, medical problems not documented			1				0				0				0	
8531	Did the client receive a medical exam or medical screening within 30 days of commitment? (Check all No responses that apply) (Initial Review Only)	169	12	55	93.4 %	125	6	66	95.4%	128	2	86	98.5%	116	6	111	95.1%
8532	Did the client receive a full dental examination within 30 days of commitment? (Check all No responses that apply) (Initial Review Only)	173	8	55	95.6 %	130	2	65	98.5%	125	5	86	96.2%	116	5	112	95.9%
	No, not timely			2				2				2				3	
	No, other			0				0				1				2	
8533	Has the client received regular health care, including immunizations and/or treatment for identified health needs, during the review period? (Services delivered) (Check all No responses that apply)	189	37	10	83.6 %	171	19	7	90.0%	192	14	10	93.2%	190	29	14	86.8%
	No treatment for identified needs			3				1				1				1	
	No, Medicaid			1				0				0				3	
	No, delay in services, systemic			2				1				1				0	
	No, immunizations			6				0				2				3	
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through			28				16				10				18	
	No, other			1				1				1				6	
8534	Has the client received regular dental care and treatment for identified dental needs during the review period? (Services delivered) (Check all No responses that apply)	167	59	10	73.9 %	160	30	7	84.2%	188	18	10	91.3%	187	32	14	85.4%
	No treatment for identified needs			3				4				0				0	
	No, Medicaid			3				0				0				1	
	No, delay in services, systemic			2				3				2				2	
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through			52				23				15				28	
	No, other			2				1				1				2	

Statewide DYC - Community Placement

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011

reviewDate	quarter3	1st Quarter SFY 2011				2nd Quarter SFY 2011				3rd Quarter SFY 2011				4th Quarter SFY 2011			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
Well Being Outcome 3																	
Item 23: Mental Health of Child																	
Health																	
8535	Were mental health services provided to meet the client's needs during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply)	176	19	41	90.3 %	118	18	61	86.8%	125	22	69	85.0%	118	30	85	79.7%
	No available services			0				0				0				1	
	No referral			0				1				1				1	
	No sufficient services			1				1				2				0	
	No, MH systems issue			0				0				0				1	
	No, Medicaid			0				1				0				0	
	No, OOH provider issue			0				3				2				0	
	No, changed mental health provider			15				10				17				21	
	No, client refused services			0				1				1				7	
	No, delays of 2 + weeks			3				4				2				2	
Miscellaneous																	
8557	Were the child/youth's mental health needs assessed?	234	1	1	99.6 %	195	0	2	00.0%	215	1	0	99.5%	229	1	3	99.6%
Systemic Factors																	
Item 25: Process to Ensure Each Child Has a Written Case Plan Developed Jointly with Parents																	
Case Planning/Services																	
8519	Does the DCP contain a description of the type and appropriateness of the homes or facilities in which the client was placed during the review period?	154	72	10	68.1 %	159	30	8	84.1%	164	35	17	82.4%	187	31	15	85.8%

Statewide DYC - Community Placement

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011

		1st Quarter SFY 2011				2nd Quarter SFY 2011				3rd Quarter SFY 2011				4th Quarter SFY 2011			
reviewDate	quarter3	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
Miscellaneous																	
Miscellaneous																	
Court																	
8501	Is there a mittimus 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 No responses that apply) (Initial Review Only)	177	14	45	92.7 %	130	10	57	92.9%	124	14	78	89.9%	114	15	104	88.4%
	No best interest			8				7				6				10	
	No mittimus			0				0				1				0	
	No reasonable efforts/emergency			11				6				6				11	
	No, contains "nunc pro tunc" language			4				4				4				1	
	No, dual reasonable efforts			0				0				1				0	
8502	Is this a combined 6-month period review and Permanency Hearing with the ALJ?	38	165	33	18.7 %	50	147	0	25.4%	41	172	3	19.2%	47	185	1	20.3%
IV-E																	
8503	Has IV-E Eligibility been determined within 45 days of removal?	139	32	65	81.3 %	98	18	81	84.5%	99	10	107	90.8%	91	8	134	91.9%
8504	Has a timely IV-E redetermination been completed during the review period? (Re-Review Only)	6	5	225	54.5 %	14	8	175	63.6%	9	1	206	90.0%	16	2	215	88.9%
Due Process																	
8505	Were all required parties invited to the review and given at least two-weeks' notice? (Check all No responses that apply)	208	28	0	88.1 %	166	31	0	84.3%	188	28	0	87.0%	204	29	0	87.6%
	No, client			0				2				1				1	
	No, client manager			1				2				1				0	
	No, father/guardian			21				22				16				22	
	No, mother/guardian			11				8				8				7	
	No, not timely			0				0				0				1	
	No, provider			1				3				3				1	
Miscellaneous																	
Miscellaneous																	
8555	Were the previous compliance issues addressed?	23	11	202	67.6 %	31	16	150	66.0%	30	16	170	65.2%	31	23	179	57.4%