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Summary

The Jeffco Community Connection (JCC) project was developed to be a model of system collaboration. Within the Jefferson County Human Services Department, JCC connects two programs, the Federal Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) and Jefferson County's Division of Children, Youth and Families (CYF). Funded by a Children's Bureau discretionary grant, JCC began in 2006 as a new practice for serving dual-system families and established a bridge between the two programs by identifying and addressing service delivery gaps and coordinating services for families. As envisioned, CYF staff provides case planning, family assessment, job resource development, and data-sharing technology while TANF provides income support and employment assistance.

The JCC project compared 160 dual-system families, which included kinship families, children in the child welfare system, and families receiving in-home services. They were divided into three intervention groups to participate in the following practices:

- Comprehensive family assessment (CFA)
- CFA and family group conferencing (FGC)
- CFA, FGC, and Parent Partner mentoring
To determine effectiveness of the program, outcome data was collected at several levels. Family outcome data were collected at baseline, every 6 months, and at case closure using the North Carolina Family Assessment Scale for General Services (NCFAS-G), CFA, and about eight self-report instruments. Project staff assessed client and staff perceptions of collaborative services; measures of family permanency, safety, self-sufficiency, prosperity, and support; and community partnerships. Results from these assessments are used for intervention, case planning, and to evaluate the program's impact.

In April 2011 the project completed a preliminary evaluation report, Assessing Outcomes Among Dual-System Welfare and Child Welfare Involved Families, which included both qualitative and quantitative data. Findings that emerged from the qualitative case study of one family included the importance of timely case closure, the need to match program services to a family's unique situation, and the potential for Parent Partner mentors to increase their instrumental assistance to families in addition to providing social support.

One quantitative analysis did not identify any significant changes by treatment group from baseline to 6-month follow-up, most likely due to the small follow-up sample size (40 cases) and to inconsistency in delivery of services. As the program comes to an end, JCC hopes, with high-quality data and a comprehensive evaluation approach, to show solid evidence of the benefit of service collaboration, CFA, FGC, Parent Partner mentoring, and other services implemented by the program.

Families gave positive feedback about the project. They said they experienced an increase in effective support, clearer expectations and guidelines, help with developing realistic case planning goals, and less anxiety when meeting with social services workers. Mentors from Parent Partners appeared helpful in preventing relapse from substance abuse and collecting data for the CFAs.

The preliminary evaluation report offers recommendations for program personnel, which include placing more focus on improving program processes and communication related to referral, participant status, and tracking.

Project Description

Abstract
The Jeffco Community Connection (JCC) is a model of collaboration between the Jefferson County, CO, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) system and its Division of Children, Youth and Families (CYF) for improving outcomes for children and families. The purpose of the JCC project is to make the services provided by the county’s child welfare and TANF systems more effective by establishing a platform between the two systems and by identifying and addressing service delivery gaps. Key project components include:

- Culturally appropriate, collaborative case planning
- Comprehensive and integrated family assessment
- Interagency service delivery focused on life skills, community resources, domestic violence, substance abuse, and mental health screening and referral
- Job resource development
- Cross-system training
- A Parent Partners mentoring program
- Development of data-sharing technology

This project began with Children’s Bureau grant funding in 2006. The evaluation study placed program families into one of three intervention groups:

- Comprehensive family assessment (CFA)
- CFA and family group conferencing (FGC)
- CFA, FGC, and Parent Partners mentoring

Part of the project’s work has been to enlist support from program directors and other middle managers in the TANF and child welfare systems to promote acceptance of collaborative efforts among frontline staff. The project gradually expanded to include wraparound community services (e.g., housing) through community partners such as churches, businesses, and the mayor’s office.

Need for This Service
Between January 1, 2010, and December 31, 2010, there were 11,359 children and youth in out-of-home care in Colorado. Jefferson County is the fourth most populated of Colorado’s 64 counties. Like many suburban communities in the nation, the county’s families are dealing with homelessness and poverty.
The current economic climate has led to substantial budget cuts that have directly affected social service agencies’ ability to keep up with client demands for services. Jefferson County Human Service’s TANF program provides income support and employment assistance to low-income families. The program provides eligible recipients with a maximum of 60 months of employment and training services, which includes up to 12 months of education services in lieu of employment-related activities. Jefferson County Human Services has found that there is not enough financial support for all potential TANF program customers. Coordinating services will allow the two programs to match resources to the needs of their clients and produce better outcomes for the families they serve.

**Target Population**

As of May 2011, there were 200 families in the JCC program, including kinship families, children in the child welfare system, and families receiving in-home services. The program found that child welfare data showed that certain ZIP Codes had high numbers of child welfare referrals and high concentrations of families living in poverty. Families were randomly selected from these identified ZIP Codes to participate in the JCC program.

The Jefferson County population comprises Hispanic, Caucasian, African-American, and Asian people, as well as refugees from Myanmar and Republic of Croatia.

**Collaborating Programs**

The JCC project goal is to provide effective services for children, youth, and families through the intentional strengthening of coordination and collaboration of the TANF and child welfare system. Jefferson County CYF is a former Children’s Bureau Systems of Care (SOC) grantee and provides a solid foundation for much of the JCC work. SOC is a service-delivery approach that builds partnerships to create a broad, integrated, family-centered process for meeting families’ multiple needs. Through Jefferson County’s grant, the agency implemented a comprehensive, functioning SOC in which all systems are encouraged to collaborate to provide support and prevention services. The systems and programs are blended to develop a common culture and infrastructure; at times it may be difficult to distinguish among various programs in the continuum of services.

The Jeffco Prosperity Project, another project that collaborates with JCC, has helped to address family barriers to accessing services by the following:

- Implementing prevention outreach services
• Developing a program in which parent mentors act as advocates to ensure the child welfare system addresses the needs of TANF families
• Creating funds to support kinship families involved in child welfare services or TANF
• Providing quarterly home visits to assess families' service needs
• Providing TANF community resources and navigation of services
• Addressing the needs of relative caregivers. Relative caregivers receive 95 percent of TANF benefits, so the project has collaborated with adjacent counties to identify and provide necessary services.

Site Visit Highlights

This site visit took place on May 2, 2011, at Jefferson County Human Services. It included a tour of the building and panel presentations by staff from each of the following program components:

• Family group conferencing
• Parent Partner program
• Evaluation
• Jeffco Community Connection (JCC) human services interagency and community collaborations
• Steering Committee
Lessons Learned

Unique and Innovative Features

*Family Group Conferencing*

The Jefferson County Division of Children, Youth and Families (CYF) traditionally uses team decisionmaking (TDM) meetings to bring families together to make safety decisions about their children. The Children’s Bureau discretionary grant provided resources to offer targeted families receiving Temporary Assistance to Needy Families and child welfare (TANF/CW) assistance with additional support through family group conferences (FGCs). A family-driven practice, FGCs not only help families develop plans to ensure protection for their children, they also help ease communication between child welfare workers and families. The FGC model continues to help TANF/CW programs explore innovative ways to increase family-driven practices and community participation.

The FGC facilitator or coordinator provides expertise and supports all team members in creating a family-centered atmosphere. The preparation phase is viewed as a critical component of the FGC intervention. The coordinator helps all participants prepare, often investing 15–35 hours over 3 to 4 weeks.

The facilitator/coordinator provides support to TANF/CW families in the following ways:

- Educating attendees about FGC
- Discussing relevant issues and barriers
- Discovering relevant strengths
- Hearing about desired outcomes
- Itemizing resources
- Interviewing attendees about potential participants
- Identifying missing family members
- Designing cultural and traditional activities for meetings
- Learning about language needs
- Sharing information with key participants

The FGC offers each family a family-style meal and private family time, allowing them to develop a plan for the child together. Families are encouraged to define what “family” means for them. Families meet alone for an unlimited time (generally about 1 hour). They are encouraged to have one person help the group maintain focus and another to take notes. During this time, a plan is
designed around the family's strengths, concerns, and resources. The agency must then agree that it can support the family's proposal before it becomes an FGC plan.

**Parent Partner Program**

Jeffco Community Connection (JCC) also designed and implemented a mentoring component based on the Parent Partner model. Parent Partners are former TANF and/or child welfare families that have completed their requirements for involvement with TANF successfully and/or closed their child welfare cases. The JCC program requires that volunteers have achieved at least 1 year of sobriety, if substance abuse was an issue, and completed 14 weeks of training. As mentors, Parent Partners provide emotional support and healthy role modeling, and help families navigate the TANF and child welfare systems. Parent mentors accompany TANF/CW families to their TDM and FGC meetings, act as advocates for their assigned families, and encourage self-advocacy. In addition, because Parent mentors represent the voice of families and the local community, they play active roles on various workgroups and committees. They have become integral in helping the county revise and update CYF's policies and practices to become more family-friendly and family-focused. Parent mentors also have assisted two other counties in creating similar programs.

**Steering Committee**

JCC has mobilized a strong community-based steering committee to help support families in the child welfare and TANF systems in Jefferson County. The group's 20 members include representatives from the following agencies or organizations: probation, police, schools, a homeless coalition, public health, domestic violence, public defender, aging services, early and higher education, businesses, the mayor's office, and the faith-based community. The steering committee meets monthly.

The committee's goal is to support families (focusing on giving support that is unavailable from government) and to help break the cycle of poverty in their community. Committee members discuss ways to help strengthen families, including undocumented families. Each committee member is committed to making a difference in his or her community by ensuring that vital program services continue to exist through the committee's support, with or without government assistance.

One committee member who grew up locally owns a coffee house. She has firsthand knowledge of how the community's demographics have shifted. She uses her business to host steering committee meetings, advertise community events, and to link families to the vital resources that other committee members offer. In addition to her committee involvement, she has employed a teenaged child of a TANF family through a summer work program.
Through the committee, students and families from the project’s target population have received computers, Parent Partner mentoring, food bank donations such as turkey baskets at holidays, and food services in emergencies. The committee also has developed agency partnerships to help families gain access to housing under the guidance of community development.

**Challenges**
The project had difficulties recruiting subjects and retaining them for the more intensive phase of the project, and the database systems used by TANF and child welfare were incompatible, so staff devised a compromise.

- **Initially the project faced challenges recruiting** and enrolling 60 clients per year, as proposed. Process data were used to guide important refinements to program operations, including new strategies to increase the number of clients participating with Parent Partner mentors.

  - TANF cases lasting 24 months or more are now referred directly to JCC by managers. This eliminates the reliance on referrals from individual case managers. The FGC coordinator or facilitator maintains contact with families, caseworkers, and managers who have completed an FGC. Some of these families have requested subsequent meetings, thereby increasing retention of families involved in the system. This service is made available to families even after their TANF/CW case has ended. JCC staff evaluated cases referred to the project by child welfare.

  - Several types of cases, such as delinquency and reunion placements, were assessed to be appropriate for the FGC process and therefore were recommended as ‘entry doors’ for additional referrals. In fact, the FGC process was too intense for these families, and as a result, child welfare management declined the additions because of workforce challenges and funding difficulties.

- **Self-selection of clients out of their assigned groups**, particularly those with more intensive interventions, such as FGC and Parent Partners created challenges for the random assignment evaluation design. The project has retained its proposed evaluation design by enlisting the following practices:

  - Conducting case studies to examine why clients opt out of the more intensive service components
  - Making changes in referral and recruitment practices to encourage improved “adherence” by clients to the random assignment
- Adopting an intent-to-treat\(^1\) approach to analyze interventions received and outcomes

- **Identifying and tracking** dually served families proved difficult due to the different database systems used by TANF and child welfare. JCC developed and uses a Blackboard system to share files and data between the two systems. This data is not only shared across programs but is also used to improve service provision across systems.

### Successful Strategies

Many factors contributed to the positive aspects of the project, including leadership and commitment, a tool for assessing data, and improved information sharing.

- **Leadership and Buy-in:** Strong leadership has helped Jefferson County move from old, agency-driven behavior to a more customer service-driven environment, with new practices such as increased collaboration, coaching, and problem-solving to better serve the children and families involved in the TANF/CW systems. Increased buy-in from leadership also resulted in more caseworker referrals and increased program enrollment. Evaluation and project staff continue to meet regularly to ensure the project is on course.

- **Data Scorecard:** JCC has developed a scorecard instrument based on the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) indicators. This instrument was developed by a group of counties to have a tool to understand and monitor CFSR and other important outcomes. The scorecard focuses on safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes, collecting information and performing quality assurance reviews. The data inform agency processes and practices for service provision and help the agency analyze the effectiveness of their programs and make informed decisions about adapting services, policies, and procedures as necessary.

---

\(^1\) Intent-to-treat (also known as intention-to-treat) analysis examines effects of treatments as assigned rather than treatment as received. JCC analyzes effects of the interventions with subjects kept in the groups they were assigned to, even if they didn’t receive those interventions. This approach avoids certain biases that arise when effects of treatment are analyzed as received rather than as assigned. It describes the effect of encouraging someone toward a particular intervention in the real world, where they may not actually receive the intervention because they don’t want it, it’s not available when they need it, or they are at a point in their case where it is not feasible.
• **Information Sharing:** The project has automated the analysis and reporting of CFA and North Carolina Family Assessment Scale for General Services (NCFAS-G) data to provide more timely results overviews to caseworkers for planning and service-delivery purposes. Now caseworkers are aware of what each system is doing with a client, and this information can be used in case planning. The ability to share TANF and child welfare files and data also helps the agency identify clients who are not child welfare clients but who may need prevention services.

**Other Lessons Learned**

Jeffco Community Connection devised a list of lessons learned and they include:

**Family Group Conferencing**

The FGC process is viewed as temporary by many staff because funding for it comes from a 5-year grant. By including a sustainability process, the authors of the grant or the program development forum, which existed during the grant's first 9 months, could have negated or minimized this concern.

It is difficult to change the way caseworkers provide services and how they work with clients. Transition and acceptance would have been easier if project developers had included expectations for supervisors to hold caseworkers accountable for their involvement with FGC. This also would have assisted with the referral process, thus increasing the number of newly created cases accepted into the JCC program and ultimately FGC.

The lack of holding families accountable for following their plans or creating backup plans has been the weakest piece of the FGC process (both for JCC and internationally). Outcomes might have been improved if this issue had been addressed early in the grant process.

**Parent Partner Program**

Only a small number of referrals for new Parent Partner candidates have come from caseworkers and case managers across systems. The majority of referrals have come through word of mouth or from participants who self-refer after seeing advertisements in the community or at the Jefferson County Human Services building. Developing an outreach plan that encourages JCC staff to share information about the Parent Partner program might have increased both agency and community awareness.
Evaluation

Capturing the quantitative outcomes for parent partner mentors, in addition to families, may prove to be helpful in future interventions. It appears parent partners gain valuable benefit from the advice and support they provide to other parents, as well as from the support they receive from the program.

Outcomes

Evaluation

Methodology

Family outcome data are collected every 6 months using the comprehensive family assessment (CFA). Data are collected at baseline, after 1 year of program participation, and at case closure using the North Carolina Family Assessment Scale for General Services (NCFAS-G). The instruments used include the following:

- CFA Self Report Battery
- Family Group Conferencing (FGC) Observation Protocol
- FGC Satisfaction Survey
- NCFAS-G
- Case studies
- Online survey of caseworkers

Outcomes assessed include the following:

- Client and staff perceptions of collaborative services
- Family permanency
- Family safety
- Family self-sufficiency/prosperity
- Family support
- Community partnership

Results from the self-report CFA instrument are used for intervention and case planning, as well as to evaluate the program’s impact. Parent Partners administer surveys in groups or individually. Families receive $50 incentive payments for completing baseline surveys and $75 for completing each follow-up survey. CFA data are supplemented by caseworker ratings of family
characteristics at case opening and closing, as well as through the NCFAS-G used for Jeffco Community Connection (JCC) program data collection. Qualitative data are gathered through interviews and focus groups.

_Evaluation Results_

Client satisfaction data indicate that families are moderately satisfied with Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). More than half of families reported they were somewhat or very satisfied with their overall experience. In general, families rated greater satisfaction with their case manager, who assesses families’ strengths and barriers to determine what supports they need, helps them set goals, and monitors their progress through the program, than with their program specialist, who receives and reviews TANF applications to determine clients’ initial and ongoing program eligibility. Client perceptions of services from the Division of Children, Youth and Families improved slightly after 6 months.

Other findings include the following:

- Clients demonstrated that services provided through JCC improved their outcomes and progression through TANF and child welfare. A statistically significant increase was found in JCC client scores on each subscale of the NCFAS-G from baseline to closure (n=62; average length between measurements was 7.2 months). Closure ratings for all subscales averaged between “baseline/adequate” and “mild strength.”

- While no significant differences were found on CFA measures from baseline to 6 months, positive trends and improvements were noted in social support, resources, parenting views, parenting stress, perceived stress, employment, and job satisfaction.

- The FGC satisfaction surveys show the following outcomes:
  - The majority of families indicated positive responses.
  - Ninety percent of families reported “full participation” in the process and agreed that they were told they could bring supports to the conference.
  - Eighty-eight percent of families reported that FGC was the best way to create a plan influencing their family’s well-being. They thought that the “right people” were at the table to make decisions and that the plan seemed reasonable.

- Families who presented during the roundtable discussion claimed to experience the following benefits from their FGC participation:
Families said they experienced support that was more effective because the expectations and guidelines were clear. In case planning the facilitator helped them to develop realistic plans and backup plans as well.

Clients were better informed about their roles, rights, and responsibilities. Families stated there was little planning with the traditional team decisionmaking process.

Preparing for the FGC helped reduce families' anxieties when meeting with social services caseworkers.

Families said they felt respected during a vulnerable time (involvement with the child welfare system). “The FGC process provides a venue of effective communication, in a neutral place, where private family time is respected. I felt this process helped to bring our family together.”

Parent Partners’ participation appeared to be helpful in preventing relapse and recidivism. Collecting quantitative data to evaluate outcomes experienced by Parent Partners may reveal additional program benefits.

Dissemination
The grantee has begun comprehensive dissemination activities through community news releases, newsletters, and internal reports shared with county staff and directors. Staff plan to develop a project website. Conference presentations and submissions to peer-viewed journals also will be used to disseminate evaluation findings.

Sustainability
The grantee is working on sustainability by assessing cost-benefit and financial requirements to keep the program operating. Client outcome data and analyses are continuing and upon completion will contribute to better understanding of program effects.

Attachments

- [Comprehensive family assessment](http://library.childwelfare.gov/cwig/ws/library/docs/gateway/SimpleSearchForm) definition
- Family group conference brochure for professionals and service providers
- Jeffco Community Connection Collaboration Project brochure
- Jefferson County CFSR Scorecard Report
- Parent Partner Manual
- Parent Partner Program brochure
- Systems of Care Toolkits
Jeffco Community Connection

A Jefferson County Human Services federally funded demonstration grant project committed to collaboration between TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) and Child Welfare (Children, Youth & Families).

Families will benefit when the two systems share information and develop single case plans. Many services will occur within the family’s neighborhood.

The work of this grant is aimed at helping families to build on their strengths to become self-sufficient, and to sustain safe and healthy homes for their children.

Family Group Conference
... a family focused & family driven decision making process

Information for Professionals & Service Providers
The purpose of a Family Group Conference is to create a plan for child safety, permanency, well being & self-sufficiency. Families are encouraged to build on their strengths, plan for their children & family’s future. The conference is attended by people who can help the family create & execute their plan. No two Family Group Conferences are alike because no two families are alike.

Partnering Together with Families to Protect & Provide for Children

The Meeting

The Family Group Conference is broken into stages. The first stage, “Information Sharing”, will include all attendees. They will discuss concerns, resources and strengths.

Stage two is called “Private Family Time”. During this stage the service providers leave the room while the family privately develops their plan. The plan will identify persons responsible for activities & time frames for the plan. Service providers are available to answer questions, as needed by the family.

During stage three, “The Agreement”, all of the attendees reconvene. The family presents their plan. Modifications are made, as needed, and a consensus is reached.

The Family Plan

The details are written into a ‘Family Service Plan’ that includes the family’s plan. Plans include:

- Parents’ & other family members’ commitments
- Commitments & expectations of service providers
- Timelines for carrying out the ‘Family Plan’
- How to know when commitments & expectations are complete
- Who will monitor completion of the ‘Family Plan’
- All attendees will receive a copy of the plan.

Who Participates

- Parent, grandparents , other family members who are concerned with the interests of the child(ren) and family & non-related persons who are considered to be ‘family’
- Children may attend in some instances.— a support person will be assigned to attend with the child
- Community people, such as neighbors & ministers, school representatives, counselors, case workers/managers and other types of service providers
- Speakerphones will be used when people can not attend due to distance, illness or other reasons
- The facilitator will not include people who could harm other attendees

Preparation

- The facilitator will talk to each person before the conference and prepare him/her for the process. People will be encouraged to consider family strengths & ideas for resolving areas of concern
- Case workers/managers and other professionals will be prepped about identifying current issues, concerns, resources and strengths related to the family
- Any attendee may identify other people who should attend the conference
- Arrangements for disabilities, transportation, child care & language needs will be made in advance
- Family traditions will be added to the format of the conference, this might include food or meals
- The Facilitator will ask about safety concerns, prior to the meeting.
- Parents/Legal Guardians and attendees receive conference invitations with the date, time and location
Go to Where the Families Live
This grant will service the people living in Edgewater and the surrounding area. Families living in this community have a difficult time traveling to Jefferson County Human Services in Golden to attend case conferences and other required meetings. For this reason, the grant staff will be conducting the Family Group Conferences in the community where the families live.

Parent Partner Mentoring Program
Another component of the grant is the Parent Partner Program. Parent Partners are former clients who have successfully completed their TANF and CYF services and have achieved self-sufficiency. They have created safe and healthy homes for their children and families. These former clients are recruited to help current families to better understand the TANF and CYF processes while utilizing those services. The idea is that current clients can benefit from having a mentor, who has been in their shoes, to help guide them through the system.

Information Sharing
The grant will also fund the development of an information-sharing software program. A big obstacle to collaboration between social service systems is often the inability to share important information about clients who are in more than one system. The data-sharing program will allow the appropriate TANF and child welfare staff to keep in touch with each other about the case plans of shared clients.

Cross-System Training
Another obstacle for TANF and child welfare staff who have common clients is their lack of knowledge about each other’s systems. The grant will develop cross-system trainings on the rules, regulations and requirements of each system. This will give case workers and managers the ability to help families to create case plans that will work for them, but that will also conform to the rules of both systems.

Career Services
Career Services planning with the Jeffco Workforce Center is another component of the grant. Workforce staff will help families who are in both the TANF and child welfare systems find jobs with employers in their community. The goal is to find permanent jobs that offer liveable wages and will help families become self-sufficient. Workforce staff will recruit employers who understand the unique needs of the families, such as time to attend treatment sessions, or to visit with their children in foster care.

Why this grant project is needed
Significant problems exist for families at risk for entering the TANF and child welfare systems. Interagency collaboration is absolutely essential to providing dual-system families the best possible chance of getting on their feet. The work of this grant is aimed at helping families to build on their strengths to become self-sufficient, and to sustain safe and healthy homes for their children.
families

Natalie Williams, Project Manager
Phone: 303.271.4003

Jan Hopkins, Facilitation Specialist
Phone: 303.271.4758

Linda Leeper, Parent Partner Coordinator
Phone: 303.271.4762

Rick Emerick, Administrative Specialist
Phone: 303.271.4794

Fax: 303.271.4708

JEFFCO COMMUNITY CONNECTION Collaboration Project
**Scoring Guidelines**

Scores represent the percent of the goal achieved. For instance, if the goal for an item is 90% and the performance for a county is 80% - the score would be 88.9 (80% / 90%). Maximum possible points for an item is 100 - which indicates that the goal was met or exceeded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFSR Measures</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>2010-Q4</th>
<th>2011-Q1</th>
<th>2011-Q2</th>
<th>2011-Q3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absence of A/N Recurrence</strong></td>
<td>&gt;94.6%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children do not experience repeat maltreatment within 6 months of a confirmed report of Abuse or Neglect (A/N)</td>
<td>17 / 334</td>
<td>18 / 252</td>
<td>17 / 307</td>
<td>13 / 371</td>
<td>65 / 1,225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absence of Abuse in Care</strong></td>
<td>&gt;99.68%</td>
<td>99.62%</td>
<td>99.82%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>99.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children will not experience confirmed abuse or neglect in foster care</td>
<td>2 / 533</td>
<td>1 / 543</td>
<td>0 / 527</td>
<td>0 / 503</td>
<td>7 / 827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeliness of Reunification</strong></td>
<td>&gt;75.2%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reunifications (reunification, living with other relative) occurred within 12 months of the date of removal</td>
<td>64 / 76</td>
<td>49 / 65</td>
<td>70 / 78</td>
<td>30 / 37</td>
<td>213 / 256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median LOS for Reunifications</strong></td>
<td>&lt;5.4 mos</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Length of Stay for Reunifications</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reunify for 1st Time Removals</strong></td>
<td>&gt;48.4%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children removed from home for first time, % reunified in 12 months.*</td>
<td>61 / 85</td>
<td>67 / 95</td>
<td>39 / 54</td>
<td>45 / 65</td>
<td>213 / 300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Children removed from 4/1/09 to 3/31/10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Re-Entry</strong></td>
<td>&gt;90.1%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children reunified during date range who do not re-enter OOH care within 12 months.*</td>
<td>79 / 87</td>
<td>90 / 99</td>
<td>95 / 109</td>
<td>47 / 59</td>
<td>308 / 348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Children reunified from 4/1/09 to 3/31/10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adoption Finalizations</strong></td>
<td>&gt;36.6%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children who exited care to a finalized adoption were finalized in less than 24 months from the time of the latest removal from</td>
<td>10 / 22</td>
<td>8 / 21</td>
<td>14 / 28</td>
<td>4 / 9</td>
<td>36 / 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median LOS for Finalizations</strong></td>
<td>&lt;27.3 mos</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median time in care for children who exit care to a finalized adoption</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFSR Measures</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>2010-Q4</th>
<th>2011-Q1</th>
<th>2011-Q2</th>
<th>2011-Q3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-Jun 10</td>
<td>Jul-Sep 10</td>
<td>Oct-Dec 10</td>
<td>Jan-Mar 11</td>
<td>Apr-10-Mar-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalizations for Children in Care Long Periods of Time</td>
<td>&gt;17.7%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in OOH Care for 17 consecutive mos as of end of period, % that Achieved Finalization within 12 mos</td>
<td>62 / 223</td>
<td>47 / 201</td>
<td>47 / 196</td>
<td>43 / 198</td>
<td>43 / 198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legally free children adopted in less than 12 months</td>
<td>&gt;53.7%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children freed for adoption will be adopted within 12 months of termination*</td>
<td>11 / 24</td>
<td>11 / 17</td>
<td>13 / 24</td>
<td>9 / 16</td>
<td>43 / 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exits to permanency for children in care 24+ months</td>
<td>&gt;29.1%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Foster Care for 24+ months exit to permanency prior to 18th birthday</td>
<td>44 / 165</td>
<td>40 / 154</td>
<td>33 / 144</td>
<td>32 / 145</td>
<td>32 / 145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharges to Permanent Plcmt for Legally Freed Children</td>
<td>&gt;98%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children who were legally free and discharged to permanency prior to 18th birthday</td>
<td>27 / 30</td>
<td>32 / 35</td>
<td>25 / 25</td>
<td>12 / 13</td>
<td>96 / 103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emancipations from Plcmt</td>
<td>&lt;37.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of all children who either (1) were, prior to their 18th birthday, discharged from foster care in FY with a discharge reason of emancipation, or (2) reached their 18th birthday in FY while in foster care, what percent were in foster care for 3 years or longer?</td>
<td>5 / 15</td>
<td>8 / 14</td>
<td>5 / 12</td>
<td>2 / 6</td>
<td>19 / 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Stability</td>
<td>&gt;86.7%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in care less than 12 mos</td>
<td>239 / 260</td>
<td>260 / 281</td>
<td>270 / 290</td>
<td>260 / 274</td>
<td>423 / 450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place children who have been in foster care for less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home have had no more than 2 placement settings</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Stability</td>
<td>&gt;65.4%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in care between 12 and 24 mos</td>
<td>90 / 131</td>
<td>80 / 121</td>
<td>66 / 97</td>
<td>63 / 92</td>
<td>106 / 153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place children who have been in foster care for more than 12 months but less than 24 months from the time of the latest removal from home have had no more than 2 placement settings</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Stability</td>
<td>&gt;41.8%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in care over 24 mos</td>
<td>57 / 173</td>
<td>55 / 172</td>
<td>50 / 165</td>
<td>42 / 165</td>
<td>76 / 233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place children who have been in foster care for more than 24 months from the time of the latest removal from home have had no more than 2 placement settings</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**DRAFT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-CFSR Measures</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>2010-Q4</th>
<th>2011-Q1</th>
<th>2011-Q2</th>
<th>2011-Q3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-Jun 10</td>
<td>Jul-Sep 10</td>
<td>Oct-Dec 10</td>
<td>Jan-Mar 11</td>
<td>Apr-10-Mar-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remain Home</strong></td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children who were not initially (first 30 days) in OOH placement and did not enter OOH placement during case involvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>131 / 162</td>
<td>103 / 121</td>
<td>169 / 193</td>
<td>207 / 223</td>
<td>608 / 697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abuse after Services</strong></td>
<td>&gt;95%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children whose case closed within period, what % did not have subsequent founded abuse within 6 months (excludes PA4 youth)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 / 209</td>
<td>9 / 192</td>
<td>8 / 254</td>
<td>10 / 177</td>
<td>34 / 789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Children closed from 04/01/2009 to 03/31/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Re-Involvement</strong></td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children whose case closed within period, what % did not have subsequent case involvement within 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 / 225</td>
<td>20 / 270</td>
<td>13 / 277</td>
<td>18 / 226</td>
<td>59 / 997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Children closed from 04/01/2009 to 03/31/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeliness of Initial Response</strong></td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td></td>
<td>110 / 124</td>
<td>132 / 146</td>
<td>93 / 110</td>
<td>132 / 140</td>
<td>467 / 520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Calendar Days</td>
<td></td>
<td>347 / 386</td>
<td>313 / 353</td>
<td>280 / 304</td>
<td>282 / 311</td>
<td>1222 / 1354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Calendar Days</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Working Days</td>
<td></td>
<td>734 / 775</td>
<td>884 / 945</td>
<td>707 / 750</td>
<td>562 / 672</td>
<td>2887 / 3142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Working Days</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monthly Face-to-Face Contacts</strong></td>
<td>&gt;95%</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the minimum Volume 7 requirements for contact with the child/youth in the facility met?</td>
<td></td>
<td>164 / 165</td>
<td>159 / 166</td>
<td>148 / 151</td>
<td>172 / 173</td>
<td>643 / 655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(measured using ARD results - Quest. 1447)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jefferson COUNTY RESULTS:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># at or Above Goal:</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score:</td>
<td>2223 / 2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># between 90 and 100% Goal:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall % Goal:</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># at Less than 90% Goal:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parent Partner Program

Jeffco Community Connection

For more information contact:

Linda Leeper
Parent Partner Coordinator
Phone: (303) 271-4762
Fax: (303) 271-4708
E-mail: lleeper@jeffco.us

3500 Illinois St
Suite 2200
Golden, Co 80401
There is, and you can be a part of the change!

Parent Partners are parents who have had personal experience with the Child Welfare system and basic cash assistance, known as Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF).

Parent Partners know that it is not easy to navigate all the processes and paperwork.

Because they have this unique knowledge, Parent Partners can help educate professionals about families’ needs and cultures.

Parent Partners can help other families navigate the systems and learn to advocate for themselves.

How do Parent Partners educate professionals?

Parent Partners attend community meetings and speak at conferences.

They review materials and co-facilitate training.

They let their voices be heard!

How do Parent Partners help other families?

Parent Partner Mentors help families through mentoring, attending court and other meetings with families and help them navigate the systems. They share their knowledge and experience.

What does it take to be a Parent Partner?

The ability to share your knowledge and experience with staff, community professionals, and other families to help guide family driven services.

Your family has been on TANF and/or had a Child Welfare case in Jefferson County and your child welfare case is closed.

A desire to help other families navigate the systems.

Some of your spare time.

You can make a difference!