

# **Child and Family Services Reviews**

# Colorado Final Report 2017



This page is intentionally blank.

### Final Report: Colorado Child and Family Services Review

### INTRODUCTION

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the state of Colorado. The CFSRs enable the Children's Bureau to: (1) ensure conformity with certain federal child welfare requirements; (2) determine what is actually happening to children and families as they are engaged in child welfare services; and (3) assist states in enhancing their capacity to help children and families achieve positive outcomes. Federal law and regulations authorize the Children's Bureau, within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families, to administer the review of child and family services programs under titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act. The CFSRs are structured to help states identify strengths and areas needing improvement in their child welfare practices and programs as well as institute systemic changes that will improve child and family outcomes.

The findings for Colorado are based on:

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Colorado Department of Human Services and submitted to the Children's Bureau
  on August 15, 2017. The statewide assessment is the state's analysis of its performance on outcomes and the functioning of
  systemic factors in relation to title IV-B and IV-E requirements and the Title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan
- The results of case reviews of 65 cases (40 foster care and 25 in-home) conducted via a Traditional Review process at Denver, Pueblo, and Garfield Counties, Colorado, during the week of September 18, 2017
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
  - Attorneys for the agency
  - Attorneys for children/youth
  - Attorneys for parents
  - Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA)
  - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) staff
  - Child welfare agency senior managers and directors
  - Child welfare caseworkers and supervisors
  - Child welfare county and state program administrators
  - Court system/Court Improvement Project (CIP)
  - Foster/adoptive licensing staff
  - Foster/adoptive parents
  - Judges

- Parents
- Public/private agency training staff
- Service providers
- State licensed/approved child care facility staff
- Tribal liaison and ICWA coordinator
- Tribal representatives
- Youth served by the agency

In Round 3, the Children's Bureau suspended the use of the state's performance on the national standards for the 7 statewide data indicators in conformity decisions. For contextual information, Appendix A of this report shows the state's performance on the 7 data indicators. Moving forward, the Children's Bureau will refer to the national standards as "national performance." This national performance represents the performance of the nation on the statewide data indicators for an earlier point in time. For the time periods used to calculate the national performance for each indicator, see 80 Fed. Reg. 27263 (May 13, 2015).

### **Background Information**

The Round 3 CFSR assesses state performance with regard to substantial conformity with 7 child and family outcomes and 7 systemic factors. Each outcome incorporates 1 or more of the 18 items included in the case review, and each item is rated as a Strength or Area Needing Improvement based on an evaluation of certain child welfare practices and processes in the cases reviewed in the state. With two exceptions, an item is assigned an overall rating of Strength if 90% or more of the applicable cases reviewed were rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies to those items. For a state to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95% or more of the cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome.

Eighteen items are considered in assessing the state's substantial conformity with the 7 systemic factors. Each item reflects a key federal program requirement relevant to the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) for that systemic factor. An item is rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement based on how well the item-specific requirement is functioning. A determination of the rating is based on information provided by the state to demonstrate the functioning of the systemic factor in the statewide assessment and, as needed, from interviews with stakeholders and partners. For a state to be in substantial conformity with the systemic factors, no more than 1 of the items associated with the systemic factor can be rated as an Area Needing Improvement. For systemic factors that have only 1 item associated with them, that item must be rated as a Strength for a determination of substantial conformity.

The Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round of reviews and in response to feedback from the child welfare field. As such, a state's performance in the third round of the CFSRs is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round. Appendix A provides tables presenting Colorado's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Colorado's performance in Round 2.

### I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

### Colorado 2017 CFSR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes and Systemic Factors

None of the 7 outcomes was found to be in substantial conformity.

The following 2 of the 7 systemic factors were found to be in substantial conformity:

- Quality Assurance System
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community

### Children's Bureau Comments on Colorado Performance

The following are the Children's Bureau's observations about cross-cutting issues and Colorado's overall performance:

Colorado's county-administered, state-supervised child welfare system is built on strong collaborative partnerships in the counties and at the state level. The Quality Assurance System and Agency Responsiveness to the Community systemic factors, as reviewed in the CFSR, were found to be operating within federal requirements, giving the state a strong foundation upon which to further improve performance in safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes. Additionally, the counties reviewed have a strong and stable workforce with manageable caseloads, which contributes to positive outcomes in some areas.

The CFSR identified cross-cutting practice concerns that affect the state's ability to meet safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes. The Children's Bureau encourages Colorado to focus its Program Improvement Plan on the following key cross-cutting priorities: conducting quality initial and ongoing assessments specific to Youth in Conflict (YIC) cases; achieving timely permanency for children in foster care; engaging parents, specifically fathers; and assessing and addressing fathers' needs.

The review showed strong findings in initiating investigations timely. Services such as parent respite and wraparound services through the mobile response unit were effective at keeping children safely at home and preventing children from coming into care. The CFSR identified challenges in assessing and managing risk and safety concerns in in-home and foster care cases, particularly for YIC cases. Safety concerns for cases identified during the review include insufficient initial risk and safety assessments, lack of ongoing risk and safety assessments, and assessing and addressing the needs of other children in the home for in-home cases. Case review results showed safety services that were needed and not provided and safety plans that were put in place but not monitored.

To achieve timely permanency for children in foster care, Colorado can build on the strong outcomes in cases where children were placed with their relatives. Most of these children had stable placements, were maintained together with siblings, and had positive relationships with their parents and other important family and community connections. Concerns with regard to achieving permanency were often seen around significant delays to achieving permanency for children with the goal of adoption. There were

various reasons for the delays, including a lengthy appeals process, the need to secure adoption subsidies timely, attorney delays, and in some instances waiting to identify an adoptive resource before filing for termination of parental rights (TPR). The Children's Bureau encourages Colorado to continue to work with the court system and the Court Improvement Project to improve timely permanency.

To improve parent engagement for both in-home and foster care cases, Colorado can build on strong practices already in place related to consistent family team meetings and provision of in-home supportive and respite care services to meet families' identified needs. The CFSR case review results revealed opportunities to better engage parents, particularly fathers, through assessment and service provision, ongoing visitation, and involvement in case planning.

The systemic factors of Quality Assurance and Agency Responsiveness to the Community were found to be functioning within federal standards. While the state did not meet the requirements for Service Array, the review noted a number of strong services in some areas of the state, such as educational support services, mobile crisis unit support for families, intensive in-home services, home visitation services, and family reunification services. The review showed barriers including a lack of transportation, affordable housing, and Medicaid-supported services in rural areas. The counties did demonstrate creative ways of obtaining the needed services for the children and families within their care. These efforts, coupled with the foundation of the agency's collaboration with counties, stakeholders, and community partners, provide a strong foundation for Colorado to build upon in its efforts to improve outcomes for children and families.

### II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

For each outcome, we provide performance summaries from the case review findings. The CFSR relies upon a case review of an approved sample of foster care cases and in-home services cases. Colorado provides an alternative/differential response to, in addition to a traditional investigation of, incoming reports of child maltreatment or children in need of services. In this report, performance on in-home alternative/differential response cases are included with the in-home cases.

This report provides an overview. Results have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Details on each case rating are available to the Colorado Department of Human Services. The state is encouraged to conduct additional item-specific analysis of the case review findings to better understand areas of practice that are associated with positive outcomes and those that need improvement.

### Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Item 1.

### **State Outcome Performance**

Colorado is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 75% of the 28 applicable cases reviewed.

### Safety Outcome 1 Item Performance

### Item 1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether responses to all accepted child maltreatment reports received during the period under review were initiated, and face-to-face contact with the child(ren) made, within the time frames established by agency policies or state statutes.

State policy requires that Immediate Response referrals received during business hours require an attempt to contact the victim child by the end of the business day. Immediate Response referrals that come in outside of business hours require an attempt within 8 hours of receipt of the referral. Referrals received that indicate impending danger of moderate to severe harm require a 3-calendar-day response. Referrals received with an absence of safety concerns require a 5-working-day response. Initiation is defined as an interview or observation of the alleged victim within the assigned response time, with a face-to-face interview if the child has the verbal capacity to communicate and observation if the child does not have the verbal ability.

• Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 75% of the 28 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the Safety statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

# Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 2 and 3.

### **State Outcome Performance**

Colorado is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 62% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 63% of the 40 foster care cases and 60% of the 25 in-home services cases.

### Safety Outcome 2 Item Performance

### Item 2. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-Entry Into Foster Care

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to provide services to the family to prevent children's entry into foster care or re-entry after a reunification.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 75% of the 24 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 72% of the 18 applicable foster care cases and 83% of the 6 applicable in-home services cases.

### Item 3. Risk and Safety Assessment and Management

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess and address the risk and safety concerns relating to the child(ren) in their own homes or while in foster care.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 62% of the 65 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 63% of the 40 foster care cases and 60% of the 25 in-home services cases.

### Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 4, 5, and 6.

### **State Outcome Performance**

Colorado is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 40% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed.

### Permanency Outcome 1 Item Performance

### **Item 4. Stability of Foster Care Placement**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether the child in foster care is in a stable placement at the time of the onsite review and that any changes in placement that occurred during the period under review were in the best interests of the child and consistent with achieving the child's permanency goal(s).

• Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 73% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 5. Permanency Goal for Child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether appropriate permanency goals were established for the child in a timely manner.

Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 82% of the 39 applicable cases were
rated as a Strength.

### Item 6. Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, Adoption, or Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether concerted efforts were made, or are being made, during the period under review to achieve reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement.

• Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 55% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the Permanency statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

# Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

### **State Outcome Performance**

Colorado is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 80% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed.

### Permanency Outcome 2 Item Performance

### **Item 7. Placement With Siblings**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that siblings in foster care are placed together unless a separation was necessary to meet the needs of one of the siblings.

• Colorado received an overall rating of Strength for Item 7 because 90% of the 21 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 8. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that visitation between a child in foster care and his or her mother, father, <sup>1</sup> and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child's relationship with these close family members.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For Item 8, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification. The persons identified in these roles for the purposes of the review may include individuals who do not meet the legal definitions or conventional meanings of a mother and father.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 73% of the 30 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 43% of the 7 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of
  visitation with a sibling(s) in foster care who is/was in a different placement setting was sufficient to maintain and promote the
  continuity of the relationship.
- In 82% of the 28 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her mother was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 63% of the 19 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of
  visitation between the child in foster care and his or her father was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the
  relationship.

### **Item 9. Preserving Connections**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to maintain the child's connections to his or her neighborhood, community, faith, extended family, Tribe, school, and friends.

• Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 84% of the 38 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 10. Relative Placement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to place the child with relatives when appropriate.

• Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 86% of the 36 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 11. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in foster care and his or her mother and father<sup>2</sup> or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

• Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 63% of the 27 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For Item 11, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification.

- In 74% of the 27 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive
  and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her mother.
- In 58% of the 19 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive
  and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her father.

### Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 12, 13, 14, and 15.

### **State Outcome Performance**

Colorado is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 51% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 48% of the 40 foster care cases and 56% of the 25 in-home services cases.

### Well-Being Outcome 1 Item Performance

### Item 12. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency (1) made concerted efforts to assess the needs of children, parents,<sup>3</sup> and foster parents (both initially, if the child entered foster care or the case was opened during the period under review, and on an ongoing basis) to identify the services necessary to achieve case goals and adequately address the issues relevant to the agency's involvement with the family, and (2) provided the appropriate services.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 51% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 48% of the 40 foster care cases and 56% of the 25 in-home services cases.

<sup>3</sup> For Sub-Item 12B, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable "mothers" and "fathers" for the period under review in the case.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

### Sub-Item 12A. Needs Assessment and Services to Children

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 80% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 85% of the 40 foster care cases and 72% of the 25 in-home services cases.

### Sub-Item 12B. Needs Assessment and Services to Parents

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 51% of the 55 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 43% of the 30 applicable foster care cases and 60% of the 25 in-home services cases.
- In 73% of the 55 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 47% of the 43 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of fathers.

### Sub-Item 12C. Needs Assessment and Services to Foster Parents

• Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 79% of the 33 applicable foster care cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 13. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made (or are being made) to involve parents<sup>4</sup> and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 72% of the 58 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 76% of the 33 applicable foster care cases and 68% of the 25 in-home services cases.
- In 76% of the 34 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.

<sup>4</sup> For Item 13, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "mother" and "father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable "mothers" and "fathers" for the period under review in the case.

- In 91% of the 54 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 68% of the 37 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve fathers in case planning.

### Item 14. Caseworker Visits With Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the child(ren) in the case are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 83% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 93% of the 40 foster care cases and 68% of the 25 in-home services cases.

### Item 15. Caseworker Visits With Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the mothers and fathers<sup>5</sup> of the child(ren) are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 63% of the 54 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 59% of the 29 applicable foster care cases and 68% of the 25 in-home services cases.
- In 74% of the 54 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 54% of the 37 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with fathers were sufficient.

### Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Item 16.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> For Item 15, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" is typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable mother and fathers for the period under review in the case.

### **State Outcome Performance**

Colorado is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 90% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed.

### Well-Being Outcome 2 Item Performance

### Item 16. Educational Needs of the Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To assess whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess children's educational needs at the initial contact with the child (if the case was opened during the period under review) or on an ongoing basis (if the case was opened before the period under review), and whether identified needs were appropriately addressed in case planning and case management activities.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 90% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 97% of the 30 applicable foster care cases and 70% of the 10 applicable in-home services cases.

# Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 3 using the state's performance on Items 17 and 18.

### **State Outcome Performance**

Colorado is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 3.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 73% of the 60 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 75% of the 40 foster care cases and 70% of the 20 applicable in-home services cases.

### Well-Being Outcome 3 Item Performance

### Item 17. Physical Health of the Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the physical health needs of the children, including dental health needs.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Strength for Item 17 because 92% of the 49 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 95% of the 40 foster care cases and 78% of the 9 applicable in-home services cases.

### Item 18. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the children.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 63% of the 38 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 57% of the 23 applicable foster care cases and 73% of the 15 applicable in-home services
  cases.

### III. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS

For each systemic factor below, we provide performance summaries and a determination of whether the state is in substantial conformity with that systemic factor. In addition, we provide ratings for each item and a description of how the rating was determined. The CFSR relies upon a review of information contained in the statewide assessment to assess each item. If an item rating cannot be determined from the information contained in the statewide assessment, the Children's Bureau conducts stakeholder interviews and considers information gathered through the interviews in determining ratings for each item.

### **Statewide Information System**

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 19.

### **State Systemic Factor Performance**

Colorado is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

### Statewide Information System Item Performance

### Item 19. Statewide Information System

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The statewide information system is functioning statewide to ensure that, at a minimum, the state can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child who is (or, within the immediately preceding 12 months, has been) in foster care.

 Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment. Colorado agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.

Information in the statewide assessment showed that the state is not operating a statewide information system that can
readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child in foster care.
Colorado does not have a mechanism to cross-check the accuracy of the information entered into Trails, the statewide
information system. The state is modernizing the system to address this issue.

### **Case Review System**

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24.

### **State Systemic Factor Performance**

Colorado is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. Three of the 5 items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

### Case Review System Item Performance

### Item 20. Written Case Plan

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a written case plan that is developed jointly with the child's parent(s) and includes the required provisions.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Strength for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that Colorado requires the development of family service plans with the
  parent and child, if age-appropriate. Administrative Review Division (ARD) data reported in the statewide assessment showed
  that almost all children in out-of-home care have written case plans and most of those plans are developed jointly with
  families.

### Item 21. Periodic Reviews

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that a periodic review for each child occurs no less frequently than once every 6 months, either by a court or by administrative review.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Strength for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that the state has a process for the periodic review by the ARD of the status of each child at least every 6 months. Data presented in the statewide assessment indicated that almost all children in out-of-home care had periodic reviews no less frequently than every 6 months.

### **Item 22. Permanency Hearings**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a permanency hearing in a qualified court or administrative body that occurs no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Strength for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that the state has a process in place to ensure that each child in foster care has a permanency hearing no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and at least every 12 months thereafter while in foster care. The state provided statewide data to demonstrate that permanency hearings are occurring timely for almost all of the children in care for 12 months or longer. Data also confirmed that a court order in the case file that was signed and dated within the past 12 months included language about reasonable efforts to achieve permanency.

### Item 23. Termination of Parental Rights

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that the filing of termination of parental rights proceedings occurs in accordance with required provisions.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data in the statewide assessment showed that the state does not consistently document compelling reasons for not filing a
  motion for TPR. The statewide assessment did not provide data to demonstrate timely filing of TPR petitions, and
  stakeholders reported inconsistencies in timely filing. Stakeholders attributed delays in timely filing of TPR to agency staffing
  issues, appellate court rulings resulting in delays, and systemic issues around the processing of TPR/adoption casework
  documentation.

### Item 24. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning to ensure that foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care are notified of, and have a right to be heard in, any review or hearing held with respect to the child.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 24 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed variation across the state as to whether foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care are notified of and have an opportunity to be heard in reviews and hearings held with respect to the child.

### **Quality Assurance System**

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 25.

### **State Systemic Factor Performance**

Colorado is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

### **Quality Assurance System Item Performance**

### **Item 25. Quality Assurance System**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The quality assurance system is functioning statewide to ensure that it (1) operating in the jurisdictions where the services included in the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) are provided, (2) has standards to evaluate the quality of services (including standards to ensure that children in foster care are provided quality services that protect their health and safety), (3) identifies strengths and needs of the service delivery system, (4) provides relevant reports, and (5) evaluates implemented program improvement measures.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Strength for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders confirmed that the state has
  developed and implemented an effective quality assurance system with standards to ensure that children in foster care are
  provided quality services that protect their safety and health. The QA system, which encompasses ARD reviews, fatality
  reviews, egregious incident reviews, and C-STAT reports, identifies the strengths and needs of service delivery, provides
  relevant reports, and evaluates implemented improvement measures. The Division of Child Welfare provides technical
  assistance to the counties when deficiencies are identified.

### **Staff and Provider Training**

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 26, 27, and 28.

### **State Systemic Factor Performance**

Colorado is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Staff and Provider Training. One of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

### Staff and Provider Training Item Performance

### Item 26. Initial Staff Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that initial training is provided to all staff who deliver services pursuant to the CFSP that includes the basic skills and knowledge required for their positions.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders confirmed that Colorado does not
  have a state-level tracking process to monitor workers' compliance with training requirements. Colorado has a curriculum of
  CORE training for newly hired staff that all staff receive before they assume a caseload or job responsibilities. Caseworkers
  and supervisors are monitored and certified at the county level upon completion of their pre-service training requirements,
  including completion of all transfer-of-learning (TOL) activities. Colorado has begun improvements via Trails modernization to
  allow monitoring and tracking compliance at the state level.

### **Item 27. Ongoing Staff Training**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that ongoing training is provided for staff<sup>6</sup> that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Strength for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and gathered during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state requires ongoing training for caseworkers and supervisors. A variety of training opportunities are available in the community, and a tracking mechanism ensures that adequate training is received by all staff. Data in the statewide assessment showed that most caseworkers and supervisors complete trainings and that the training is of good quality. Stakeholders reported that staff in more rural counties have more limited training opportunities but confirmed that they were able to meet training requirements.

<sup>6</sup> "Staff," for purposes of assessing this item, includes all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP. "Staff" also includes direct supervisors of all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP.

### **Item 28. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that training is occurring statewide for current or prospective foster parents, adoptive parents, and staff of state licensed or approved facilities (that care for children receiving foster care or adoption assistance under title IV-E) that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to foster and adopted children.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed the state has limited ability to provide quantitative or qualitative data about how well the initial and ongoing training provided by county departments, child placement agencies, and facilities addresses the skills and knowledge base needed by foster parents and facility staff to carry out their duties with regard to children in foster care. Compliance with foster parent training requirements is assessed through the state's quality assurance and licensing reviews of foster care home certifications, although data regarding statewide compliance is incomplete.

### **Service Array and Resource Development**

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 29 and 30.

### **State Systemic Factor Performance**

Colorado is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Service Array and Resource Development. None of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

### Service Array and Resource Development Item Performance

### Item 29. Array of Services

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The service array and resource development system is functioning to ensure that the following array of services is accessible in all political jurisdictions covered by the CFSP: (1) services that assess the strengths and needs of children and families and determine other service needs, (2) services that address the needs of families in addition to individual children in order to create a safe home environment, (3) services that enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable, and (4) services that help children in foster and adoptive placements achieve permanency.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 29 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that although the state provides a comprehensive service array through the child welfare agency's Core Services Program and has the ability to adapt and adjust these services through flexible funding, the service array is more accessible in the larger metropolitan areas

than in the more rural areas of the state. Stakeholders reported a lack of affordable housing resources throughout the state, a lack of transportation services, and insufficient availability of substance abuse treatment and Medicaid-funded services. Waiting lists delay the availability of services and affect timely achievement of permanency.

### Item 30. Individualizing Services

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The service array and resource development system is functioning statewide to ensure that the services in Item 29 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children and families served by the agency.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 30 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state lacks the capacity to provide individualized services for families and children throughout the state. Stakeholders reported that although Colorado has a Core Services Program, the state lacks the ability to individualize services for the children and families served. Stakeholders reported that staff rely heavily on their own creative capacities to find services, and often those services do not meet the specific needs of the children and families.

### **Agency Responsiveness to the Community**

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 31 and 32.

### **State Systemic Factor Performance**

Colorado is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. Both of the items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

### Agency Responsiveness to the Community Item Performance

### Item 31. State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that, in implementing the provisions of the CFSP and developing related APSRs, the state engages in ongoing consultation with Tribal representatives, consumers, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies and includes the major concerns of these representatives in the goals, objectives, and annual updates of the CFSP.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state engages in ongoing consultation with a broad array of key internal and external stakeholders. The state is effective in soliciting

stakeholders' input with regard to the agency's overall goals and objectives; is responsive to their recommendations; and integrates the input into goals, objectives, and annual updates.

### Item 32. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state's services under the CFSP are coordinated with services or benefits of other federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that the state effectively coordinates services delivered under the CFSP with services provided by other federal programs serving the same population. The state's partners include courts; the state's Medicaid agency (Health Care Policy and Financing (HCPF)); Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting; Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) programs; Colorado Children's Trust Fund and federal early childhood funding; and Colorado's Departments of Public Health and Environment, Education, and Labor.

### Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 33, 34, 35, and 36.

### **State Systemic Factor Performance**

Colorado is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. Two of the four items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

### Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention Item Performance

### **Item 33. Standards Applied Equally**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that state standards are applied to all licensed or approved foster family homes or child care institutions receiving title IV-B or IV-E funds.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that the state has a process in place to issue licenses. Although data regarding county-issued foster care home certifications and recertifications are available, data regarding child placement agency-issued foster care home certifications and Department of Child Welfare-issued licenses are not captured in a manner that shows whether the agency is applying standards equally to all certified foster care homes and licensed facilities.

Stakeholders reported gaps in communication among the various licensing entities and differences in the application of standards and practices for certifying homes.

### Item 34. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state complies with federal requirements for criminal background clearances as related to licensing or approving foster care and adoptive placements and has in place a case planning process that includes provisions for addressing the safety of foster care and adoptive placements for children.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Strength for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state has a
  consistent procedure to ensure statewide compliance with criminal background check requirements and the means to gather
  and report data. The state requires criminal background clearances for foster and adoptive families before placement and
  obtains fingerprint clearances before licensure.

### Item 35. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families who reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the state for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed is occurring statewide.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Strength for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that statewide diligent recruitment efforts include regular and ongoing review and analysis of the state's population and frequent adjustments to meet general as well as specific state needs.

### Item 36. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the effective use of cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate timely adoptive or permanent placements for waiting children is occurring statewide.

- Colorado received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that Colorado needs to
  improve the timeliness of its response to home study requests received from other states. Common reasons for delays
  include lack of cooperation from the proposed placement homes, lack of employee resources, difficulty coordinating
  schedules, and delayed responses from placement homes and facilities. Colorado anticipates that Trails modernization,
  enhanced training, and a focus on monitoring will lead to more effective cross-jurisdictional placements.

# Appendix A Summary of Colorado 2017 Child and Family Services Review Performance

### I. Ratings for Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being Outcomes and Items

**Outcome Achievement:** Outcomes may be rated as in substantial conformity or not in substantial conformity. 95% of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the state to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

**Item Achievement:** Items may be rated as a Strength or as an Area Needing Improvement. For an overall rating of Strength, 90% of the cases reviewed for the item (with the exception of Item 1 and Item 16) must be rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies.

### SAFETY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN ARE, FIRST AND FOREMOST, PROTECTED FROM ABUSE AND NEGLECT.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Safety Outcome 1 Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	Not in Substantial Conformity	75% Substantially Achieved
Item 1 Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	75% Strength

# SAFETY OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN ARE SAFELY MAINTAINED IN THEIR HOMES WHENEVER POSSIBLE AND APPROPRIATE.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Safety Outcome 2 Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate	Not in Substantial Conformity	62% Substantially Achieved
Item 2 Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Area Needing Improvement	75% Strength
Item 3 Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	62% Strength

### PERMANENCY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN HAVE PERMANENCY AND STABILITY IN THEIR LIVING SITUATIONS.

The state of the s		
Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Permanency Outcome 1 Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	Not in Substantial Conformity	40% Substantially Achieved
Item 4	Area Needing Improvement	73% Strength
Stability of foster care placement		
Item 5	Area Needing Improvement	82% Strength
Permanency goal for child		
Item 6	Area Needing Improvement	55% Strength
Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption,		
or other planned permanent living arrangement		

# PERMANENCY OUTCOME 2: THE CONTINUITY OF FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND CONNECTIONS IS PRESERVED FOR CHILDREN.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Permanency Outcome 2 The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children	Not in Substantial Conformity	80% Substantially Achieved
Item 7 Placement with siblings	Strength	90% Strength
Item 8 Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	73% Strength
Item 9 Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	84% Strength
Item 10 Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	86% Strength
Item 11 Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	63% Strength

# WELL-BEING OUTCOME 1: FAMILIES HAVE ENHANCED CAPACITY TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN'S NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Well-Being Outcome 1 Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	51% Substantially Achieved
Item 12 Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	51% Strength
Sub-Item 12A Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	80% Strength
Sub-Item 12B Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	51% Strength
Sub-Item 12C Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	79% Strength
Item 13 Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	72% Strength
Item 14 Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	83% Strength
Item 15 Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	63% Strength

# WELL-BEING OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Well-Being Outcome 2 Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	90% Substantially Achieved
Item 16 Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	90% Strength

# WELL-BEING OUTCOME 3: CHILDREN RECEIVE ADEQUATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Well-Being Outcome 3 Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	73% Substantially Achieved
Item 17 Physical health of the child	Strength	92% Strength
Item 18 Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	63% Strength

### **II. Ratings for Systemic Factors**

The Children's Bureau determines whether a state is in substantial conformity with federal requirements for the 7 systemic factors based on the level of functioning of each systemic factor across the state. The Children's Bureau determines substantial conformity with the systemic factors based on ratings for the item or items within each factor. Performance on 5 of the 7 systemic factors is determined on the basis of ratings for multiple items or plan requirements. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with these systemic factors, the Children's Bureau must find that no more than 1 of the required items for that systemic factor fails to function as required. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with the 2 systemic factors that are determined based on the rating of a single item, the Children's Bureau must find that the item is functioning as required.

### STATEWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 19 Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement

### **CASE REVIEW SYSTEM**

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Case Review System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 20 Written Case Plan	Statewide Assessment	Strength
Item 21 Periodic Reviews	Statewide Assessment	Strength
Item 22 Permanency Hearings	Statewide Assessment	Strength
Item 23 Termination of Parental Rights	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 24 Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### **QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM**

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Substantial Conformity
Item 25 Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

### **STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING**

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Staff and Provider Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 26 Initial Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 27 Ongoing Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Item 28 Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### SERVICE ARRAY AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Service Array and Resource Development	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 29 Array of Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 30 Individualizing Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### AGENCY RESPONSIVENESS TO THE COMMUNITY

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Substantial Conformity
Item 31 State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 32 Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Statewide Assessment	Strength

### FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE PARENT LICENSING, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 33 Standards Applied Equally	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 34 Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 35 Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Statewide Assessment	Strength
Item 36 State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### III. Performance on Statewide Data Indicators<sup>7</sup>

The state's performance is considered against the national performance for each statewide data indicator and provides contextual information for considering the findings. This information is not used in conformity decisions. State performance may be statistically above, below, or no different than the national performance. If a state did not provide the required data or did not meet the applicable item data quality limits, the Children's Bureau did not calculate the state's performance for the statewide data indicator.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> In October 2016, the Children's Bureau issued Technical Bulletin #9 (<a href="http://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/cfsr-technical-bulletin-9">http://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/cfsr-technical-bulletin-9</a>), which alerted states to the fact that there were technical errors in the syntax used to calculate the national and state performance for the statewide data indicators. Performance shown in this table reflects performance based on May 2017 revised syntax that is pending final verification.

Appendix A: Summary of Colorado 2017 CFSR Performance

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Recurrence of maltreatment	9.1%	Lower	9.2%	8.5%-9.8%	FY14–15
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	8.50	Lower	15.92	13.91–18.23	14A–14B, FY14-15
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	40.5%	Higher	54.3%	52.7–55.8%	14A–16B
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12- 23 months	43.6%	Higher	51.9%	49.0%–54.9%	16A-16B
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	30.3%	Higher	34.5%	31.6%–37.4%	16A-16B
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.3%	Lower	14.8%	13.2–16.5%	14A-16B
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.12	Lower	***	***	****

<sup>\*</sup> Risk-Standardized Performance (RSP) is derived from a multi-level statistical model and reflects the state's performance relative to states with similar children and takes into account the number of children the state served, the age distribution of these children and, for some indicators, the state's entry rate. It uses risk-adjustment to minimize differences in outcomes due to factors over which the state has little control and provides a more fair comparison of state performance against national performance.

[\*\*\*\*Excluded Due to Data Quality: Identifies when performance was not calculated due to the state failing one or more data quality checks for this indicator.]

<sup>\*\* 95%</sup> Confidence Interval is the 95% confidence interval estimate for the state's RSP. The values shown are the lower RSP and upper RSP of the interval estimate. The interval accounts for the amount of uncertainty associated with the RSP. For example, the CB is 95% confident that the true value of the RSP is between the lower and upper limit of the interval.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Data Period(s) Used for State Performance: Refers to the initial 12-month period and the period(s) of data needed to follow the children to observe their outcomes. The FY or federal fiscal year refers to NCANDS data, which spans the 12-month period October 1–September 30. All other periods refer to AFCARS data. "A" refers to the 6-month period October 1–March 31. "B" refers to the 6-month period April 1–September 30. The 2-digit year refers to the calendar year in which the period ends.

# Appendix B Summary of CFSR Round 2 Colorado 2009 Key Findings

The Children's Bureau conducted a CFSR in Colorado in 2009. Key findings from that review are presented below. Because the Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round and in response to feedback from the child welfare field, a state's performance in the third round of the CFSR is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round.

### **Identifying Information and Review Dates**

<b>^</b>	 Information	

Children's Bureau Region: 8

Date of Onsite Review: March 16-20, 2009

Period Under Review: October 1, 2007, through March 20, 2009

Date Courtesy Copy of Final Report Issued: September 30, 2009

Date Program Improvement Plan Due: December 28, 2009

**Date Program Improvement Plan Approved:** May 1, 2011

### **Highlights of Findings**

### **Performance Measurements**

- A. The state met the national standards for four of the six standards.
- B. The state achieved substantial conformity with **none** of the **seven** outcomes.
- C. The state achieved substantial conformity with **two** of the **seven** systemic factors.

### **State's Conformance With the National Standards**

Data Indicator or Composite	National Standard	State's Score	Meets or Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of maltreatment recurrence (data indicator)	94.6 or higher	95.3	Meets Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.41	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	125.3	Meets Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	118.4	Meets Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	124.0	Meets Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	97.9	Does Not Meet Standard

### **State's Conformance With the Outcomes**

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

## **State's Conformance With the Systemic Factors**

Systemic Factor	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Statewide Information System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Case Review System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Quality Assurance System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Staff and Provider Training	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Service Array and Resource Development	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Achieved Substantial Conformity

# **Key Findings by Item**

### **Outcomes**

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment	Area Needing Improvement
Item 2. Repeat Maltreatment	Strength
Item 3. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-entry Into Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
Item 4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	Area Needing Improvement
Item 5. Foster Care Re-entries	Strength
Item 6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 7. Permanency Goal for Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Permanent Placement With Relatives	Area Needing Improvement
Item 9. Adoption	Area Needing Improvement
Item 10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	Strength
Item 12. Placement With Siblings	Area Needing Improvement
Item 13. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
Item 14. Preserving Connections	Area Needing Improvement
Item 15. Relative Placement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 16. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
Item 17. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster	Area Needing Improvement
Item 18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	Area Needing Improvement
Item 19. Caseworker Visits With Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 20. Caseworker Visits With Parents	Area Needing Improvement

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 21. Educational Needs of the Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 22. Physical Health of the Child	Strength
Item 23. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement

**Systemic Factors** 

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 24. Statewide Information System	Area Needing Improvement
Item 25. Written Case Plan	Area Needing Improvement
Item 26. Periodic Reviews	Strength
Item 27. Permanency Hearings	Strength
Item 28. Termination of Parental Rights	Area Needing Improvement
Item 29. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Strength
Item 30. Standards Ensuring Quality Services	Strength
Item 31. Quality Assurance System	Area Needing Improvement
Item 32. Initial Staff Training	Area Needing Improvement
Item 33. Ongoing Staff Training	Strength
Item 34. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Area Needing Improvement
Item 35. Array of Services	Strength
Item 36. Service Accessibility	Area Needing Improvement
Item 37. Individualizing Services	Area Needing Improvement
Item 38. Engagement in Consultation With Stakeholders	Strength
Item 39. Agency Annual Reports Pursuant to CFSP	Strength
Item 40. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Strength
Item 41. Standards for Foster Homes and Institutions	Strength

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 42. Standards Applied Equally	Strength
Item 43. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Strength
Item 44. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Area Needing Improvement
Item 45. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Strength