Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

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: 10/28/2010

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Safety Outcome 2

Item 4: Risk of Harm

Safety

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		507	17	1665	96.8%
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		462	37	1690	92.6%
	No Safety Plan			0				0				0				2	
	No assessment/investigation			0				0				0				21	
	No change in treatment plan			0				0				0				5	
	No court intervention			0				0				0				7	
	No placement change			0				0				0				5	
	No referral to law enforcement			0				0				0				2	
	No, not addressed			0				0				0				7	
	No, other			0				0				0				12	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placements

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		2108	52	29	97.6%
	No appropriate level of care (sanction may result)			0				0				0				2	
	No, child/youth's needs not addressed			0				0				0				9	
	No, cultural			0				0				0				6	
	No, other			0				0				0				7	
	No, relatives not considered			0				0				0				6	
	No, sibling placement issues			0				0				0				22	
	No, unable to determine where child is placed			0				0				0				6	
	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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		394	356	1439	52.5%
	Yes, in line with case goal and planned			0				0				0				301	
	Yes, to meet youth's specific needs and planned			0				0				0				93	
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	1820	
	Child on child abuse			0				0				0				5	
	More than one move			0				0				0				80	
	Other			0				0				0				45	
	Provider abuse or neglect allegations			0				0				0				64	
	Provider quit or closed			0				0				0				43	
	Provider request			0				0				0				177	
	Runaway			0				0				0				50	
	Temporary setting			0				0				0				52	
	Youth's behavior			0				0				0				156	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1941	237	11	89.1%
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?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		108	34	2047	76.1%
	No, not completed			0				0				0				30	
	Permanency																
1755	At the time of the review, are reasonable efforts being made to achieve permanency? (Check all No responses that apply)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		2131	47	11	97.8%
	No reas. efforts to perm. place with relative			0				0				0				4	
	No reasonable efforts to finalize adoption			0				0				0				22	
	No reasonable efforts to return home			0				0				0				7	
	No reasonable efforts to success. emancipate			0				0				0				1	
	No, other			0				0				0				15	
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		384	542	1263	41.5%
	No housing			0				0				0				35	
	No, ICPC			0				0				0				6	
	No, caseload/turnover			0				0				0				6	
	No, child lack of progress			0				0				0				101	
	No, child/youth services appropriateness			0				0				0				10	
	No, county attorney			0				0				0				5	
	No, court delays			0				0				0				14	
	No, lack of community supports			0				0				0				5	
	No, lack of effort/inadequate supervision			0				0				0				9	
	No, other			0				0				0				74	
	No, other potential caregiver lack of progress			0				0				0				4	
	No, parent incarc. or long term treatment program			0				0				0				59	
	No, parent lack of progress			0				0				0				415	
	No, parent(s)/guardian(s) services appropriateness			0				0				0				4	
	No, parents whereabouts are unknown			0				0				0				42	
	No, placement provider does not support perm. goal			0				0				0				11	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Permanency Outcome 1

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		44	24	2121	64.7%
	No, ICPC			0				0				0				1	
	No, certification delays			0				0				0				2	
	No, child lack of progress			0				0				0				3	
	No, court delays			0				0				0				4	
	No, diligent search			0				0				0				1	
	No, lack of community supports			0				0				0				1	
	No, other			0				0				0				5	
	No, other potential caregiver lack of progress			0				0				0				6	
	No, placement provider does not support perm. goal			0				0				0				6	
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		324	288	1577	52.9%
	No CARR listing			0				0				0				32	
	No adoptive home			0				0				0				106	
	No, ICPC			0				0				0				13	
	No, appeal of termination			0				0				0				46	
	No, appropriateness of services			0				0				0				1	
	No, caseload/turnover			0				0				0				18	
	No, child/youth declined			0				0				0				16	
	No, county/agency support issues			0				0				0				12	
	No, court delays			0				0				0				19	
	No, lack of effort/inadequate supervision/training			0				0				0				29	
	No, lack of provider support			0				0				0				9	
	No, lack of recruitment			0				0				0				20	
	No, lack of timely filing of TPR			0				0				0				2	
	No, other			0				0				0				64	
	No, placement provider does not support perm. goal			0				0				0				11	
	No, subsidy issues			0				0				0				17	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement

Case Planning/Services

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		272	277	1640	49.5%
	No description or plan of services			0				0				0				43	
	No plan			0				0				0				29	
	No self-sufficiency budget			0				0				0				163	
	No state approved assessment used			0				0				0				52	
	No, all identified needs not addressed			0				0				0				18	
	No, not timely			0				0				0				20	
	No, not updated			0				0				0				41	
	Not all ILP tabs completed			0				0				0				117	
	Not developed with youth			0				0				0				12	
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		456	78	1655	85.4%
	No re-assessment of needs			0				0				0				8	
	No referral for Chafee services			0				0				0				11	
	No, cost			0				0				0				1	
	No, lack of resources			0				0				0				5	
	No, provider issues			0				0				0				3	
	No, wait list			0				0				0				9	
	No, youth refused services			0				0				0				18	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Permanency Outcome 1

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement																	
Case Planning/Services																	
1735	Is there a comprehensive, youth-driven Emancipation Transition Plan (ETP) developed 90 business days before the youth's projected permanency date? (Check all No responses that apply) (Check only "No plan" if there is not ETP plan)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		34	36	2119	48.6%
	No plan			0				0				0				35	
	No, not all tabs completed			0				0				0				1	
1736	Per Volume 7, have all vital documents been obtained for youth with an OPPLA goal 90 business days before their projected permanency date? (Check all No responses that apply)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		59	12	2118	83.1%
	No Birth Certificate			0				0				0				2	
	No Health Passport/medical records			0				0				0				7	
	No Social Security card			0				0				0				5	
	No State ID/driver's license			0				0				0				6	
	No educational records			0				0				0				5	
	No, other			0				0				0				1	
Item 10: Other Planned Living Arrangement																	
Permanency																	
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		409	166	1614	71.1%
	No documentation			0				0				0				77	
	No, OPPLA goal not in the child's best interest			0				0				0				5	
	No, documented reasons not appropriate			0				0				0				10	
	No, not reviewed annually			0				0				0				79	
	No, other			0				0				0				4	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Permanency Outcome 2

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1264	127	798	90.9%
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?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		150	9	2030	94.3%
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		905	210	1074	81.2%
	No, GAL			0				0				0				1	
	No, OOH Provider			0				0				0				2	
	No, child/youth			0				0				0				18	
	No, county			0				0				0				7	
	No, court			0				0				0				15	
	No, father/guardian/kin			0				0				0				1	
	No, mother/guardian/kin			0				0				0				182	
	No, other			0				0				0				4	
	No, parent			0				0				0				1	
1774	Does the frequency of visitation with the father/guardian/kin adequately address the needs of the child/youth to maintain or promote continuity of the relationship? (Check all No responses that apply)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		501	214	1474	70.1%
	No, GAL			0				0				0				1	
	No, OOH Provider			0				0				0				2	
	No, child/youth			0				0				0				20	
	No, county			0				0				0				5	
	No, court			0				0				0				9	
	No, father/guardian/kin			0				0				0				183	
	No, mother/guardian/kin			0				0				0				1	
	No, other			0				0				0				12	
	No, parent			0				0				0				1	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Permanency Outcome 2

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		823	122	1244	87.1%
	No, GAL			0				0				0				4	
	No, OOH Provider			0				0				0				18	
	No, child/youth			0				0				0				12	
	No, county			0				0				0				27	
	No, court			0				0				0				6	
	No, mother/guardian/kin			0				0				0				1	
	No, other			0				0				0				46	
	No, parent/guardian/kin			0				0				0				26	
	No, sibling			0				0				0				6	
Item 14: Preserving Connections																	
Court																	
1705	Were these ICWA requirements met? (Check all that apply)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		136	206	1847	39.8%
	No "active efforts" findings			0				0				0				12	
	No "beyond reasonable doubt" lang. in term. order			0				0				0				4	
	No court order determ. if ICWA does NOT apply			0				0				0				77	
	No docum. of inquiry of Native American heritage			0				0				0				39	
	No notification sent to all identified tribes/BIA			0				0				0				61	
	No response from tribe/BIA			0				0				0				81	
	No, ICWA order of preference for placement not met			0				0				0				6	
	No, new info obtained during FF portion of review			0				0				0				19	
	No, other			0				0				0				5	
	No, tribe not notified of hearings			0				0				0				38	
Case Planning/Services																	
1728	Is the department making concerted efforts to maintain the child/youth's connections during the review period?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		2136	22	31	99.0%

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Permanency Outcome 2

Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents

Permanency

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1026	100	1064	91.1%
	Yes, encouraged attend. at doctors' appointments			0				0				0				174	
	Yes, encouraged attend. at extra-curricular activ.			0				0				0				107	
	Yes, encouraged foster parents to become mentors			0				0				0				114	
	Yes, facil. contact w/parents not in close proxim.			0				0				0				121	
	Yes, facilitated contact w/incarcerated parents			0				0				0				50	
	Yes, other			0				0				0				120	
	Yes, provid. therap. situations to strengthen rel.			0				0				0				667	
	Yes, provided transportation/funds			0				0				0				214	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Well Being Outcome 1

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

Case Planning/Services

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1776	405	8	81.4%
	No			0				0				0			310		
	No treatment plan developed			0				0				0			25		
	No, all task time frames expired			0				0				0			86		
1722	Were all required parties addressed in the treatment plan? (Check all No responses that apply)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1678	503	8	76.9%
	No treatment plan developed			0				0				0			22		
	No, all task time frames expired			0				0				0			79		
	No, child/youth			0				0				0			59		
	No, county			0				0				0			123		
	No, father/guardian			0				0				0			36		
	No, mother/guardian			0				0				0			27		
	No, other			0				0				0			4		
	No, out of home provider			0				0				0			250		
	No, some task time frames expired			0				0				0			88		
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1308	873	8	60.0%
	No treatment plan developed			0				0				0			28		
	No, all task time frames expired			0				0				0			98		
	No, measurable			0				0				0			675		
	No, realistic			0				0				0			36		
	No, specific			0				0				0			451		
	No, time-limited			0				0				0			27		

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Well Being Outcome 1

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

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1163	1020	6	53.3%
	No approval			0				0				0				251	
	No current 90-day review			0				0				0				124	
	No diligent search			0				0				0				537	
	No, barriers to progress			0				0				0				97	
	No, caregiver/kin provider services and progress			0				0				0				72	
	No, child/youth services and progress			0				0				0				159	
	No, child/youth services appropriateness			0				0				0				39	
	No, child/youth's safety			0				0				0				67	
	No, need for add./diff. svcs. and how provided			0				0				0				39	
	No, parent services and progress			0				0				0				56	
	No, parent(s)/guardian(s) services appropriateness			0				0				0				20	
	No, permanency goal			0				0				0				59	
	No, permanency goal date			0				0				0				77	
	No, task time frames			0				0				0				99	
	No, timely provision of mandated services			0				0				0				8	
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			0				0				0				301	
	CNS Depressants			0				0				0				18	
	CNS Stimulants			0				0				0				10	
	Cocaine/Crack			0				0				0				139	
	Heroin			0				0				0				25	
	Marijuana			0				0				0				213	
	Methamphetamine			0				0				0				191	
	Other			0				0				0				20	
	Other Opiates			0				0				0				32	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Well Being Outcome 1

Health

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		370	189	1630	66.2%
	No available services			0				0				0				3	
	No received provider report			0				0				0				1	
	No referral by county			0				0				0				3	
	No requested provider report			0				0				0				2	
	No sufficient services			0				0				0				1	
	No, delays of 2 + weeks			0				0				0				1	
	No, parent/guardian refused services			0				0				0				155	
	Unable to determine - outside services			0				0				0				28	
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	2022	
	Alcohol			0				0				0				85	
	CNS Depressants			0				0				0				4	
	CNS Stimulants			0				0				0				4	
	Cocaine/Crack			0				0				0				10	
	Heroin			0				0				0				2	
	Marijuana			0				0				0				137	
	Methamphetamine			0				0				0				11	
	Other			0				0				0				12	
	Other Opiates			0				0				0				3	
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		131	33	2025	79.9%
	No referral by county			0				0				0				8	
	No sufficient services			0				0				0				1	
	No, child/youth refused services			0				0				0				11	
	No, delays of 2 + weeks			0				0				0				8	
	Unable to determine - outside services			0				0				0				8	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Well Being Outcome 1

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		2124	31	34	98.6%
	No			0				0				0				27	
	No, efforts made but refused			0				0				0				4	
1715	Was the child/youth engaged in case planning, during the review period?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1155	9	1025	99.2%
	No			0				0				0				6	
	No, efforts made but refused			0				0				0				3	
1717	Was the mother/guardian/kin engaged in case planning, during the review period?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1078	134	977	88.9%
	No			0				0				0				51	
	No, efforts made but refused			0				0				0				83	
Item 18: Child/Family Involvement in Case Planning																	
1719	Was the father/guardian/kin engaged in case planning during the review period?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		681	195	1313	77.7%
	No			0				0				0				81	
	No, efforts made but refused			0				0				0				114	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

Permanency

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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		0				0				0				9		
	2		0				0				0				16		
	3		0				0				0				46		
	4		0				0				0				98		
	5		0				0				0				420		
	6		0				0				0				1396		
	7		0				0				0				110		
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		0				0				0				12		
	1		0				0				0				32		
	2		0				0				0				52		
	3		0				0				0				104		
	4		0				0				0				207		
	5		0				0				0				542		
	6		0				0				0				1070		
	7		0				0				0				76		
	Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child?				0.0%				0.0%				0.0%				92.6%
	In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?	0	0		.0%	0	0		.0%	0	0		.0%	1595	498		76.2%

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

Permanency

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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		0				0				0				20		
	2		0				0				0				19		
	3		0				0				0				11		
	4		0				0				0				7		
	5		0				0				0				9		
	6		0				0				0				67		
	7		0				0				0				5		
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		0				0				0				38		
	1		0				0				0				32		
	2		0				0				0				18		
	3		0				0				0				12		
	4		0				0				0				8		
	5		0				0				0				7		
	6		0				0				0				23		
	Of all the months requiring contact, in what percent did agency personnel have contact with the child?																2.5%
	In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?	0	0		.0%	0	0		.0%	0	0		.0%	63	75		45.7%
1767	Did the frequency of contact with the child/youth in his/her place of residence occur according to Volume 7?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1795	372	22	82.8%

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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		970	1172	47	45.3%
	No assessment of safety		0				0				0				942		
	No, outside presence of provider		0				0				0				803		

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Well Being Outcome 1

Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents

Permanency

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		631	301	1257	67.7%
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?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		780	120	1289	86.7%
1771	Did the frequency of contact with the father/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		337	178	1674	65.4%
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?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		427	74	1688	85.2%

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Well Being Outcome 2

Item 21: Educational Needs of Child

Education

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1109	464	616	70.5%
	No GED/Diploma			0				0				0				21	
	No address of current school			0				0				0				89	
	No credit count			0				0				0				37	
	No current IEP			0				0				0				135	
	No current grade reports			0				0				0				346	
	No name of current school			0				0				0				45	
1738	For children aged 3 - 5: Is the child enrolled in Head Start or another early childhood education program?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		186	60	1943	75.6%
	Information not available			0				0				0				14	
	Yes, assessed only			0				0				0				33	
	Yes, enrolled			0				0				0				153	
1739	For youth aged 16 or older: Is the youth on track to graduate and/or complete high school?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		461	115	1613	80.0%
	GED			0				0				0				33	
	GED earned			0				0				0				28	
	Graduated			0				0				0				56	
	Information not available			0				0				0				24	
	No GED			0				0				0				14	
	No, graduate			0				0				0				77	
1740	Was educational stability provided for the child during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1099	452	638	70.9%
	No, changed schools during review period			0				0				0				313	
	No, delays in record transfer			0				0				0				1	
	No, initial placement required change in school			0				0				0				153	
	No, other			0				0				0				15	
	No, req. 504 or IEP spec. ed. svcs. were not prov.			0				0				0				8	
	No, schl. distr. refused to provide appropr. svcs.			0				0				0				7	
1741	Were the child/youth's educational needs assessed?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1680	38	471	97.8%

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Well Being Outcome 3

Item 22: Physical Health of Child

Health

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		2062	116	11	94.7%
	No provider address/phone number			0				0				0				108	
	No provider name			0				0				0				75	
	No, medical problems not documented			0				0				0				17	
	No, medications not documented			0				0				0				7	
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		486	177	1526	73.3%
	No, Medicaid card			0				0				0				3	
	No, late			0				0				0				125	
	No, never occurred			0				0				0				30	
	No, other			0				0				0				24	
	Yes, appointment			0				0				0				65	
	Yes, exam			0				0				0				421	
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		381	118	1690	76.4%
	No, late			0				0				0				55	
	No, never occurred			0				0				0				44	
	No, other			0				0				0				19	
	Yes, appointment			0				0				0				17	
	Yes, exam			0				0				0				364	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Well Being Outcome 3

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1553	603	33	72.0%
	No statement from medical examiner			0				0				0				490	
	No treatment for identified needs			0				0				0				5	
	No, Medicaid			0				0				0				2	
	No, immunizations			0				0				0				58	
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through			0				0				0				159	
	No, other			0				0				0				27	
1746	Has the child/youth received regular dental care and treatment for identified dental needs? (Services delivered) (Check all No responses that apply)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1418	377	394	79.0%
	No treatment for identified needs			0				0				0				4	
	No, Medicaid			0				0				0				3	
	No, lack of timely referral or follow through			0				0				0				343	
	No, other			0				0				0				30	
Item 23: Mental Health of Child																	
Health																	
1747	Were the child/youth's mental health needs assessed?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1673	20	496	98.8%
1748	Were mental health services provided to meet the child/youth's needs during the review period? (Check all No responses that apply)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1231	247	711	83.3%
	No available services			0				0				0				5	
	No referral by county			0				0				0				9	
	No sufficient services			0				0				0				11	
	No, Medicaid			0				0				0				3	
	No, OOH provider issue			0				0				0				22	
	No, changed MH provider			0				0				0				129	
	No, child refused services			0				0				0				29	
	No, delays of 2 + weeks			0				0				0				85	
	No, mental health systems issue			0				0				0				23	
	No, other			0				0				0				24	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Systemic Factors

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		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?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1723	436	30	79.8%
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1443	41	705	97.2%
	No reasonable efforts			0				0				0				9	
	No signed court order			0				0				0				37	
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1889	300	0	86.3%
	No, Attorneys of Record (Court Ordered)			0				0				0				6	
	No, GAL			0				0				0				49	
	No, OOH Provider			0				0				0				85	
	No, Tribe/BIA (if ICWA applies)			0				0				0				77	
	No, caseworker			0				0				0				45	
	No, child over 12			0				0				0				29	
	No, father/guardian			0				0				0				70	
	No, mother/guardian			0				0				0				43	
	No, not timely			0				0				0				23	

Statewide Child Welfare

Quarterly Results for Administrative Reviews

Administrative Review Division

7/1/2010 - 9/30/2010

Miscellaneous

		2nd Quarter SFY 2010				3rd Quarter SFY 2010				4th Quarter SFY 2010				1st Quarter SFY 2011			
		Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%	Yes	No	NA	%
Miscellaneous																	
Court																	
1701	Is this a court ordered review?	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		148	2041	0	6.8%
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		643	21	1525	96.8%
	No best interest			0				0				0				1	
	No reasonable efforts/emergency			0				0				0				5	
	No signed removal order			0				0				0				9	
	No, contains "nunc pro tunc" language			0				0				0				1	
	No, dual reasonable efforts			0				0				0				6	
1704	Has the county had authority for placement within the review period? (A Fiscal Sanction may result if the answer is "No.")	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		2179	10	0	99.5%
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)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		613	53	1523	92.0%
1707	Has a timely IV-E redetermination been completed during the review period? (Re-Review Only)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		467	69	1653	87.1%
Permanency																	
1778	Were the previous compliance issues addressed? (Re-Review Only)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		623	592	974	51.3%