

CO Item Measurement Example: STATEWIDE

CO Items Requiring Measurement	Applicable cases in State baseline period	Baseline percent strengths	Z value for .80 or .95 confidence level	Calculated Baseline Sampling Error	Formula Calculated PIP Goal for Item	PIP Goal in Percent	Current	Example PIP overlap Adjustment (qtrs)	Adjustment applied for PIP overlap (qtrs)	Prospective PIP Goal in Percent
<b>Item 1: Trails</b> Number of investigations which took place in the allotted response time.	12732	76.0%	1.96	0.00741857	0.76741857	76.7%	83.0%			
<b>Item 3: Total</b>	4915	80.3%	1.96	0.011119498	0.8141195	81.4%				
<b>Item 3: ARD IH #16</b> Does the Family Services Plan treatment plan document services that are directed at the areas of need identified through assessment?	607	76.0%								
<b>Item 3: OOH #21</b> Does the Family Services Plan treatment plan document services that are directed at the areas of need identified through assessment?	4308	80.9%								

<b>Item 4: Total**</b>	2917	95.5%	1.28	0.004913033	0.95991303	96.0%				
<b>Item 4: ARD IH #22</b> Does the most recent 90-day review/Court report in Trails meet Volume 7 requirements? **	371	94.0%								
<b>Item 4: ARD OOH#24</b> Does the most recent 90-day review/Court report in Trails meet Volume 7 requirements? **	2546	95.7%								
<b>Item 7: Total</b>	4604	86.9%	1.96	0.009746169	0.87874617	87.9%				
<b>Item 7: ARD OOH #60</b> In the reviewer's opinion, is the primary court ordered permanency goal, at the time of the review, appropriate for this child/youth?	4306	88.0%								

<b>Item 7: ARD OOH #62</b> If the 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?	298	74.0%								
<b>Item 10: ARD OOH #33</b> 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?	1102	84.2%	1.96	0.021535247	0.86353525	86.4%				
<b>Item 17: Total</b>	9831	78.8%	1.96	0.00807957	0.79607957	79.6%				
<b>Item 17: ARD OOH #21</b> Does the Family Services Plan treatment plan document services that are directed at the areas of need identified through assessment?	4308	80.9%								

<b>Item 17: ARD IH# 16</b> Does the Family Services Plan treatment plan document services that are directed at the areas of need identified through assessment?	606	75.9%								
<b>Item 17: ARD OOH #22</b> Were all required parties addressed in the treatment plan?	4310	77.5%								
<b>Item 17: ARD IH #17</b> Were all required parties addressed in the treatment plan?	607	75.5%								
<b>Item 18: Total *</b>	11969	92.5%	1.28	0.003081644	0.92808164	92.8%				
<b>Item 18: ARD IH #10</b> Was the child/youth engaged in case planning, during the review period?	256	89.0%								
<b>Item 18: ARD IH #12</b> Was the mother/guardian/kin engaged in case planning, during the review period?	576	92.0%								

<b>Item 18: ARD IH #14</b> Was the father/guardian/kin engaged in case planning during the review period?	390	81.0%								
<b>Item 18: ARD OOH #13</b> Was the out-of-home provider engaged in case planning, during the review period?	4224	98.8%								
<b>Item 18: ARD OOH #15</b> Was the child/youth engaged in case planning, during the review period?	2303	99.3%								
<b>Item 18: ARD OOH #17</b> Was the mother/guardian/kin engaged in case planning, during the review period?	2476	88.5%								
<b>Item 18: ARD OOH #19</b> Was the father/guardian/kin engaged in case planning during the review period?	1744	77.1%								

<b>Item 19: Total</b>	9838	64.4%	1.96	0.009461731	0.65346173	65.3%				
<b>Item 19: ARD IH #2</b> In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?	606	59.2%								
<b>Item 19: ARD IH #5</b> Was the quality of contacts with the child/youth sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child and to promote achievement of case goals?	591	58.0%								
<b>Item 19: OOH# 64 &amp; 66</b> In what percent of cases did agency personnel have contact with the child every month?	4398	76.5%								

<b>Item 19: ARD OOH #68</b> 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?	4243	52.0%								
<b>Item 20: Total</b>	6839	76.7%	1.28	0.006543187	0.77354319	77.4%				
<b>Item 20: ARD OOH Q#69</b> Did the frequency of contact with the mother/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	1805	68.8%								

<b>Item 20: ARD OOH</b> <b>Q#70</b> 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?	1746	87.4%								
<b>Item 20: ARD OOH</b> <b>Q#71</b> Did the frequency of contact with the father/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	929	65.3%								
<b>Item 20: ARD OOH</b> <b>Q#72</b> 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?	888	88.4%								



<b>Item 20: ARD IH #4</b> Did the frequency of contact with the caregiver/guardian/kin occur according to Volume 7?	606	59.2%								
<b>Item 20: ARD IH Q#7</b> 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?	554	83.5%								
<b>Item 20: ARD IH Q#8</b> 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?	311	84.2%								

**\*Denominator does not include refusal of participation**

**\*\*Denominator is specific to Child Youth Safety in the 90 Day review**

Z value Confidence level is determined by use of statewide data versus sample data. Sample is .80(z value =1.28), statewide is .95(z=1.96)

Assumes items 1,7,10 will be all cases statewide

Overlap adjustment only applies if State collects baseline during PIP implementation

## **Appendix A - SAFETY AND RISK ASSESSMENT COACHING**

### **Purpose**

Working with county human services departments on the Colorado Assessment Continuum over the life of a case, with focus on using a coaching model. Working with counties on the completion of and utilization of assessments from case open to case closure. Working with counties regarding timely documentation, timeliness of investigations, and caseworker contacts as they relate to safety and risk.

### **Problem/Issues**

- ARD identified safety and risk as a problem in various counties. Counties need guidance regarding safety and risk assessments.
- Counties have asked for assistance/training.

### **Vision**

Divide state into regions and divide team into groups of 2s to be assigned to each region. (May need more for larger counties and less for smaller counties.)

Become familiar with what the data is telling us regarding compliance in utilization of the safety and risk assessments throughout the life of the case.

Review reports, caseload sizes, written findings regarding safety and other Trails trends information to identify counties that potentially have issues with safety practices.

Distribute copies of Volume 7 and ARD tools specific to the assessment continuum as well as other handouts to counties.

Create a statewide uniform training/coaching/monitoring plan but also have it be county specific.

Training/coaching/monitoring will be for supervisors and caseworkers so everyone is on the same page.

### **County Breakdown**

- Ruby - Denver, Adams and Elbert
  - Week of July 12<sup>th</sup> Jefferson
  - Week of August 23<sup>rd</sup> Logan, Morgan, Phillips, Sedgwick, Yuma and Washington.
  - Week of September 13<sup>th</sup> Moffat and Routt
  - Week of October 5<sup>th</sup> Weld
  - Week of October 18<sup>th</sup> El Paso and Teller
  
- Erin (dates will be provided for 2010)
  - Boulder, Broomfield, Clear Creek, Conejos, Dolores, Gilpin, Hinsdale, Montezuma, Ouray, Rio Grand, Saguache, San Juan and San Miguel
  
- Stacee (dates will be provided for 2010)
  - Alamosa, Baca, Bent, Cheyenne, Crowley, Custer, Douglas, Kiowa, Kit Carson, Las Animas, Lincoln, Otero, Prowers and Pueblo
  
- Alisa - Arapahoe, Eagle and Pitkin
  - Week of August 16<sup>th</sup> Chaffee, Garfield, Grand, Jackson, Lake, Park, Rio Blanco and Summit
  - September 15<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> Delta, Mesa and Montrose
  - Week of October 4<sup>th</sup> Larimer
  - Week of October 15<sup>th</sup> Fremont
  
- Completed counties - Gunnison, La Plata, Archuleta and Costilla

#### **Next Steps**

- Assign counties to team members
- Make contact with counties
- Meet as a team to formalize the process
- Identify approach

- Schedule ½ day meetings with counties
- Facilitate training to include ongoing and intake supervisors and caseworkers.
- Develop handouts for Safety and Risk and continuum. (Get packets together)
- Meet with Carol and pull AHA curriculum for supervisors.
- Discuss with Carol any funds available if any
- Review DR curriculum as it pertains to safety and risk