

**South Carolina Department of Social Services**  
**Child Welfare Quality Assurance Review: Spartanburg County**  
**Summary Report**

---

This summary report describes the results of the South Carolina Department of Social Services (DSS) Spartanburg County Quality Assurance Review, conducted August 11-15, 2014. The period under review was February 1, 2014 – July 31, 2014.

DSS Child Welfare Quality Assurance Reviews are conducted using the *Onsite Review Instrument* (OSRI) finalized by the federal Administration for Children & Families (ACF) in July 2008. This instrument is used to review foster care and family preservation services cases. Thirty cases were reviewed including 15 foster care and 15 family preservation cases.

The OSRI is divided into three sections: safety, permanency, and child and family well-being. There are two safety outcomes, two permanency outcomes, and three well-being outcomes. Reviewers collect information on a number of *items* related to each of the outcomes through case file review, the use of the Child and Adult Protective Services System (CAPSS), and case related interviews. CAPSS is South Carolina’s Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS), which contains all case related information. This information is detailed on the OSRI as support for rating selection.

The ratings for each *item* are combined to determine the rating for the outcome. The *items* are rated as *strength*, *area needing improvement*, or not applicable. Outcomes are rated as being substantially achieved, partially achieved, not achieved, or not applicable. Ratings for each of the outcomes are displayed in Table 1.

**Table 1. Child Welfare QA Onsite Reviews – Ratings by Outcome**

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Substantially Achieved</b>	<b>Partially Achieved</b>	<b>Not Achieved</b>
<b>Safety 1</b> CHILDREN ARE, FIRST AND FOREMOST, PROTECTED FROM ABUSE AND NEGLECT	62% (5)	38% (3)	0% (0)
<b>Safety 2</b> CHILDREN ARE SAFELY MAINTAINED IN THEIR HOMES WHENEVER POSSIBLE AND APPROPRIATE	64% (19)	13% (4)	23% (7)
<b>Permanency 1</b> CHILDREN HAVE PERMANENCY AND STABILITY IN THEIR LIVING SITUATIONS	53% (8)	47% (23)	0% (0)
<b>Permanency 2</b> THE CONTINUITY OF FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND CONNECTIONS IS PRESERVED FOR CHILDREN	40% (6)	60% (9)	0% (0)
<b>Well-Being 1</b> FAMILIES HAVE ENHANCED CAPACITY TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN’S NEEDS	20% (6)	63% (19)	17% (5)
<b>Well-Being 2</b> CHILDREN RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS	91% (10)	9% (1)	0% (0)
<b>Well-Being 3</b> CHILDREN RECEIVE ADEQUATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS	32% (7)	32% (7)	36% (8)

Results for outcomes and *items* are reported by the number of cases and the percentage of total cases given each rating. In addition, the percentage of *strengths* is calculated for each *item*. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *areas needing improvement*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the *percentage of strengths*. Appendix 1 provides more detailed analysis of issues impacting the ANI ratings.

## SECTION I: REVIEW FINDINGS

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

Two *items* are included under Safety Outcome 1. Ratings for the two *items* are shown in Table 2.

#### **Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations**

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 made, within the timeframes established by agency policies or State statute.

#### **Item 2: Repeat maltreatment**

Purpose of Assessment: To determine if any child in the family experienced repeat maltreatment within a 6-month period.

Table 2.

Rating	Item 1	Item 2
<i>Strength</i>	13% (4)	23% (7)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	10% (3)	0% (0)
<i>Not Applicable</i>	77% (23)	77% (23)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	<b>57.1% (4)</b>	<b>100% (7)</b>

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

Two *items* are included under Safety Outcome 2. Ratings for the *items* are shown in Table 3.

#### **Item 3: Services to family**

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.

Table 3.

Rating	Item 3	Item 4
<i>Strength</i>	43% (13)	70% (21)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	27% (8)	30% (9)
<i>Not Applicable</i>	30% (9)	0% (0)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	<b>61.9% (13)</b>	<b>70% (21)</b>

#### **Item 4: Risk assessment and safety 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.

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

Six *items* are included under Permanency Outcome 1. Ratings for the *items* are shown in Table 4.

#### **Item 5: Foster Care reentries**

Purpose of Assessment: To assess whether children who entered foster care during the period under review were re-entering within 12 months of a prior foster care episode.

#### **Item 6: Stability of foster care placement**

Purpose of Assessment: To determine if 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 interest of the child and consistent with achieving the child’s permanency goal(s).

**Item 7: Permanency goal for child**

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

**Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives**

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether concerted efforts were made, or are being made, during the period under review, to achieve reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives in a timely manner.

**Item 9: Adoption**

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made, or are being made, to achieve a finalized adoption in a timely manner.

**Item 10: Other planned permanent living arrangement (OPPLA)**

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure:

- That the child is adequately prepared to make the transition from foster care to independent living (if it is expected that the child will remain in foster care until he or she reaches the age of majority or is emancipated).
- That the child, even though remaining in foster care, is in a “permanent” living arrangement with a foster parent or relative caregiver and that there is a commitment on the part of all parties involved that the child remain in that placement until he or she reaches the age of majority or is emancipated.
- That the child is in a long-term care facility and will remain in that facility until transition to an adult care facility.

Table 4.

Rating	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9	Item 10
Strength	20% (6)	40% (12)	33% (10)	20% (6)	10% (3)	0% (0)
Area needing improvement	0% (0)	10% (3)	17% (5)	3% (1)	17% (5)	3% (1)
Not Applicable	80% (24)	50% (15)	50% (15)	77% (23)	73% (22)	97% (29)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)
% Strengths	<b>100% (6)</b>	<b>80% (12)</b>	<b>66.7%(10)</b>	<b>85.7% (6)</b>	<b>37.5% (3)</b>	<b>0% (0)</b>

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

Six items are included under Permanency Outcome 2. Ratings for the items are shown in Table 5.

**Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement**

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that the child’s foster care placement was close enough to the parent(s) to facilitate face-to-face contact between the child and the parent(s) while the child was in foster care.

**Item 12: Placement with siblings**

Purpose of Assessment: To determine if, 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.

**Item 13: Visiting with parents & siblings in foster care**

Purpose of Assessment: To determine if, 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, and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child’s relationship with these close family members.

**Item 14: 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.

**Item 15: 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.

**Item 16: 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 or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

Table 5.

Rating	Item 11	Item 12	Item 13	Item 14	Item 15	Item 16
Strength	37% (11)	10% (3)	17% (5)	40% (12)	23% (7)	13% (4)
Area needing improvement	3% (1)	10% (3)	27% (8)	10% (3)	23% (7)	23% (7)
Not Applicable	60% (18)	80% (24)	56% (17)	50% (15)	54% (16)	64% (19)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)
% Strengths	<b>91.7% (11)</b>	<b>50% (3)</b>	<b>38.5% (5)</b>	<b>80% (12)</b>	<b>50% (7)</b>	<b>36.4% (4)</b>

**WELL-BEING OUTCOME 1: FAMILIES HAVE ENHANCED CAPACITY TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN’S NEEDS**

Four items are included under Well-Being Outcome 1. Ratings for the items are shown in Table 6.

**Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, & foster parents**

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess the needs of children, parents, and foster parents (both at the child’s entry into foster care [if the child entered during the period under review] or 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 provided the appropriate services.

**Item 18: Child & 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 and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

**Item 19: Caseworker visits with the 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 and promote achievement of case goals.

**Item 20: 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 of the children are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the children and promote achievement of case goals.

**Table 6.**

Rating	Item 17	Item 18	Item 19	Item 20
Strength	27% (8)	30% (9)	73% (22)	13% (4)
Area needing improvement	73% (22)	67% (20)	27% (8)	77% (23)
Not Applicable	0% (0)	3% (1)	0% (0)	10% (3)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)
% Strengths	<b>26.7% (8)</b>	<b>31% (9)</b>	<b>73.3% (22)</b>	<b>14.8% (4)</b>

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

One item is included under Well-Being Outcome 2. Ratings for the item are shown in Table 7.

**Item 21: Educational needs of 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.

**Table 7.**

Rating	Item 21
Strength	33% (10)
Area needing improvement	3% (1)
Not Applicable	64% (19)
Total	100% (30)
% Strengths	<b>90.9% (10)</b>

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

Two items are included under Well-Being Outcome 3. Ratings for the items are shown in Table 8.

**Item 22: Physical health of child**

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

**Item 23: Mental/behavioral health of child**

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the child(ren).

**Table 8.**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Item 22</b>	<b>Item 23</b>
<i>Strength</i>	13% (4)	40% (12)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	47% (14)	7% (2)
Not Applicable	40%(12)	53% (16)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	<b>22.2% (4)</b>	<b>85.7% (12)</b>

**Table 9. Spartanburg County *Percentage of Strengths* on 23 Quality Assurance Items Across Four Reviews**

Item	Apr. 2013 (PUR 4-1-2012 to 3-31-2013)	July 2013 (PUR 7-1-2012 to 6-30-2013)	Feb. 2014 (PUR 2-1-2013 to 1-31-2014)	Aug. 2014 (PUR 2-1-2014 to 7-31-2014)
1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations	66.7%	82.4%	90.9%	57.1%
2. Reoccurrence of Maltreatment	94.4%	100.0%	81.8%	100%
3. Services to Family	45.5%	71.4%	47.6%	61.9%
4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	70.0%	70.0%	53.3%	70%
5. Foster Care Re-Entries	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%	100%
6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%	80%
7. Permanency Goal for Child	66.7%	60.0%	33.3%	66.7%
8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Perm. Placement with Relatives	60.0%	60.0%	50.0%	85.7%
9. Adoption	45.5%	36.4%	20.0%	37.5%
10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0%
11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	100.0%	100.0%	55.6%	91.7%
12. Placement with Siblings	72.7%	70.0%	71.4%	50%
13. Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	38.5%	58.3%	0.0%	38.5%
14. Preserving Connections	86.7%	92.9%	38.5%	80%
15. Relative Placement	60.0%	63.6%	50.0%	50%
16. Relationship of Child in Care with Parent	33.3%	54.5%	11.1%	36.4%
17. Needs and Services for Child, Parents, and Caregivers	43.3%	53.3%	33.3%	26.7%
18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	42.9%	50.0%	25.9%	31%
19. Worker Visits with Child	60.0%	66.7%	60.0%	73.3%
20. Worker Visits with Parents	16.0%	26.9%	12.5%	14.8%
21. Educational Needs of the Child	86.7%	83.3%	63.6%	90.9%
22. Physical Health of the Child	56.0%	54.5%	48.0%	22.2%
23. Mental Health of the Child	86.7%	78.9%	43.8%	85.7%

## SECTION II: FOSTER HOME LICENSE REVIEW

As part of the Quality Assurance Review Process in Spartanburg County, ten Foster Home Licenses were randomly selected from the list of all licenses issued for the county during the period under review. These licenses are reviewed using the *South Carolina Department of Social Services Quality Assurance Foster Home License Review Instruments*. There is one instrument for issuance of initial licenses and another instrument for the renewal of licenses. Each instrument contains a section of deficiencies, namely agency oversight, data entry, and qualitative issues. Deficiencies noted in this section may not invalidate the license but still require attention and correction by county management. Each instrument includes the appropriate agency, state, and federal requirements.

Initial License review criteria include the following *items*:

- Information related to firearms and ammunition in the house
- Pet vaccination information
- Background checks
- Convictions
- Required trainings
- Medical reports
- Fire inspections/re-inspections
- DHEC/Lead inspections
- Central registry check on alternative caregiver, if applicable
- A review of any conflicts noted between file documents and CAPSS
- Completion and issuance of the 1513 prior to the license being issued
- Guidelines regarding in-ground swimming pools

Renewal License review criteria include the following *items*:

- Convictions
- Training hours
- Medical reports if a new household member has been added or if there is a change in foster parent's medical status
- Fire inspections
- FBI checks, if applicable
- Guidelines regarding in-ground swimming pools
- 1513 completed prior to issuance of the license
- Any amendments to the license, if applicable
- Documentation regarding if there are more than five children in the home
- Annual firearms location update
- Safety checks of alternative caregivers
- A review of child protective service allegations
- Pet vaccination information
- A review of any regulatory infractions
- A review of any conflicts noted between file documents and CAPSS

Possible *deficiencies* found in Initial and Renewal cases include:

- Updated home studies
- Discipline Agreements
- Fire drills
- Quarterly home visits
- Disaster Preparedness Plans
- Information concerning the alternative caregivers
- Alternative caregiver forms
- Applications
- Autobiography information
- Financial information
- Child factor's checklists
- Initial home assessment studies
- References



Areas noted as having occurred as required on the assessment are rated as *strengths*. Those *items* that were not met are rated as *area needing improvement (ANI)*. If the issue is not applicable, it is rated N/A.

Additionally, the percentage of *strengths* is also calculated for each *item*. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Results of the review are noted in Table 10.

## Foster Home Licensing Findings for Spartanburg County

Note: These services are contracted to a private provider, who is responsible for the ratings instead of the county DSS office. These are included in the county report because the QA system is the present system for evaluating compliance for Foster Home License requirements with the samples pulled via the county in which the home is located to assure that all homes have the same opportunity to be in the random sampling.

**Initial License Cases.** Two foster care issuances for initial/standard license were reviewed. Information for ratings was obtained by reviewers through case file documentation, which includes the use of CAPSS. Both of the cases reviewed were rated as *strength* because all of the licensing requirements were met prior to authorization of the license issuance.

**Renewal License Cases.** Seven cases reviewed were rated as *ANI* because some pieces of the licensing requirements were not met prior to authorization of the license renewal. Information for ratings was obtained by reviewers through case file documentation, which includes the use of CAPSS.

**Table 10. Summary of Ratings for Initial and Renewal Cases**

Rating	Initial	Renewal
<i>Strength</i>	2 (100%)	1 (12.5%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	0 (0%)	7 (87.5%)
Total	2 (100%)	8 (100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	<b>2 (100%)</b>	<b>1 (12.5%)</b>

Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* for seven cases include:

### Background Checks:

- There was not documentation in the case file to verify that central registry, SLED, sex offender registry, and CPS checks for all applicable individuals were completed in a timely manner or at all. (6 cases)

### Firearms:

- Documentation verifying that ammunition was stored in a separate, locked location away from the firearms was not in the case file. (2 cases)

### Medical Records:

- Medical statement documentation for the family members was not located in the file. (2 cases)

### Training:

- Documentation was not sufficient to allow for verification of the completion of all training hours. (1 case)

**Pet Vaccination Records:**

- Documentation verifying that pet vaccinations were up-to-date or completed was not located in the case file. (1 case)

**Deficiencies found in Renewal Cases.** Deficiencies were noted for eight of the ten files reviewed. Issues identified by the reviewers include:

**Alternative Caregivers:**

- Documentation did not include identification of an alternative caregiver/ babysitter. (3 cases)

**Fire Drills:**

- Documentation verifying that fire drills were conducted within 24 hours of a child's placement was not located in the case file. (4 cases)
- Documentation verifying that quarterly fire drills were conducted while children were placed in foster homes was not located in the case file. (4 cases)

**Safety:**

- Documentation did not provide verification that quarterly home visits were completed in a timely manner or at all. (2 cases)
- All annual Discipline Agreements were not located in the case file. (3 cases)
- All Disaster Preparedness Plans were not located in the case file. (5 cases)

### SECTION III: CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICE NO ACTION REPORTS REVIEW

A review of ten no action reports was completed to determine whether agency policy and procedures were followed. The reports were randomly selected from the list of reports on which no action was taken by the county during the period under review. The *South Carolina Department of Social Services Quality Assurance Review No Action Reports Instrument* was used to conduct the review. This instrument includes a description of the allegation and fourteen questions regarding the no action decisions and processes (see Table 11).

**Table 11. Summary of Item Ratings for No Action Reports Review**

	Yes	No	NA	Total
1. Illegal substance use alleged AND reason for safety threatened with harm	1	9	0	10
2. Use of CAPSS and/or other systems for prior involvement	10	0	0	10
3a. Did the intake worker thoroughly complete the Sufficiency tab in CAPSS	9	1	0	10
3b. If question 1 or 2 is answered no, did worker provide explanation	1	0	9	10
4a. Maltreatment tab in CAPSS completed	0	0	10	10
4b. If yes to maltreatment, did worker provide an explanation	0	0	10	10
4c. If yes to maltreatment, did supervisor provide additional information	0	0	10	10
5. Safety factors documented on Intake Assessment not discovered by intake worker	0	9	1	10
6. Assessment made utilizing SCDSS Risk Matrix	9	1	0	10
7a. Risk Matrix results included statements contradictory to allegation	8	1	1	10
7b. Risk Matrix results failed to include all statements that support allegation	10	0	0	10
8. Contact with necessary collaterals prior to screen-out decision	0	6	4	10
9. Another intake referral on same perpetrator and/or child within 12 months	3	7	0	10
10. Intake Supervisor ensured consultation with another supervisory-level authority	1	3	6	10

\*Note: A single case may have more than one issue identified.

The percentage of *strengths* is also calculated for the cases reviewed. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Findings of these reviews are noted in Table 12.

**Table 12. Summary of Ratings for No Action Reports Review**

Rating	Were agency policy and procedures followed?
<i>Strength</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	10 (100%)
Total	10 (100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	<b>0 (0%)</b>

In ten cases, pieces of agency policy and procedures were not followed. Information for ratings was obtained by reviewers through case file documentation, which includes the use of CAPSS. Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* include:

- Statements documented in the Risk Matrix were contradictory to the documentation of the allegations, with no reconciliation of facts documented. (7 cases)
- Some of the areas in the Risk Matrix did not include statements to address all documented allegations made by the reporter, with no reconciliation of facts documented. (8 cases)
- There was no documentation to support that the agency made, or attempted to make, any direct contact with all indicated and appropriate collateral contacts. (6 cases)

- Case documentation indicated that the children were exposed to the sexual behaviors of the mother and male in the home, yet this was not documented in the Maltreatment Tab documentation. (1 case)

**SECTION IV: CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES UNFOUNDED REPORTS REVIEW**

Five unfounded reports were reviewed to determine whether agency policy and procedures were followed. The five unfounded reports were randomly selected from the list of all reports unfounded by the county during the period under review. The review was conducted using the *South Carolina Department of Social Services Quality Assurance Review Unfounded Report Instrument*. This instrument includes a description of the allegation and items regarding three primary areas (see Table 13):

- Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment,
- Repeat maltreatment, and
- Risk assessment and safety management.

**Table 13. Summary of Item Ratings for Unfounded Review**

1A. Investigation not initiated in accordance with timeframes and requirements. Total for five cases: 0				
1B. Face-to-face contact not made in accordance with timeframes and requirements. Total for five cases: 1				
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Total</b>
1C. Delays in investigation initiation or face-to-face contact beyond control of agency	0	1	4	5
2A. At least one substantiated or indicated maltreatment report	0	5	0	5
2B. One substantiated or indicated maltreatment report within six months before or after	0	0	5	5
2C. Repeat maltreatment involving the same or similar circumstances	0	0	5	5
3A. Initial assessment of risk to the children and family in the home	2	3	0	5
3B. Ongoing assessment(s) of risk to the children and family in the home	0	5	0	5
3C. Safety concerns that were not adequately or appropriately addressed by the agency	2	3	0	5

\*Note: A single case may have more than one issue identified.

The percentage of *strengths* is calculated for each decision to unfound. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Findings of these reviews are noted in Table 14.

**Table 14. Summary of Ratings for Unfounded Review**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Were agency policy and procedures followed?</b>
<i>Strength</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	5 (100%)
Total	5 (100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	<b>0 (0%)</b>

Information for ratings was obtained by reviewers through case file documentation, which includes the use of CAPSS. Reasons that five unfounded cases reviewed violated pieces of agency policy and procedures include:

- Case documentation did not indicate that there were sufficient initial, ongoing, and final risk and safety assessments with children in the home. (5 cases) Pieces of information that were not found in the case file documentations include:
  - There was no documentation verifying that information indicated in the background check for the parent was addressed. (3 cases)
  - There was no documentation to verify that the agency had direct contact with the mother and/or father during the investigation process of a case to assess for risk and safety. (2 cases)

- There was no documentation to verify that an assessment of the home of an alternative caregiver was conducted. (1 case)
- Documentation did not verify that all indicated and appropriate collateral contacts were made. (1 case)
- There was no documentation to verify that safety actions put in place by the Safety Plan were enacted even though no safety issues resulted. (1 case)

**SECTION V: FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES REVIEW**

A review of five allegations was completed to determine whether agency policy and procedures were followed for reports referred to Family Support Services (FSS). The reports were randomly selected from the list of reports referred to a Community-Based Prevention Services Provider by the county during the period under review. The *South Carolina Department of Social Services Quality Assurance Review Community-Based Prevention Services Assessment Instrument* was used to conduct the review. This instrument includes a description of the allegation and sixteen questions regarding the referral to the (FSS) Community-Based Prevention Services Provider and processes (see Table 15).

**Table 15. Summary of Item Ratings for Assessment**

	Yes	No	NA	Total
1. Illegal substance use alleged AND reason for safety threatened with harm	0	5	0	5
2. Use of CAPSS and/or other systems for prior involvement	5	0	0	5
3a. Did the intake worker thoroughly complete the Sufficiency tab in CAPSS	5	0	0	5
3b. If question 1 or 2 is answered no, did worker provide explanation	0	0	5	5
4a. Maltreatment tab in CAPSS completed	4	1	0	5
4b. If yes to maltreatment, did worker provide an explanation	0	0	5	5
4c. If yes to maltreatment, did supervisor provide additional information	0	0	5	5
5. Existing Safety Factors not seen by intake worker or documented	0	5	0	5
6. Assessment made utilizing SCDSS Risk Matrix	5	0	0	5
7a. Results of SCDSS Risk Matrix contradicted allegation made by reporter	4	1	0	5
7b. Did results fail to include statements to support allegations made by reporter	4	1	0	5
8. Agency contacted collaterals for Community-Based Prevention Services	1	0	4	5
9. Additional intake referral made on same perpetrator AND/OR child	0	5	0	5
10. Family received community-based prevention services	0	5	0	5
11. Community-based provider entered an account in CAPSS	5	0	0	5
12. Family accepted services from Community-Based Prevention Services Provider	2	1	2	5

\*Note: A single case may have more than one issue identified.

The percentage of *strengths* is also calculated for the cases reviewed. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Findings of these reviews are noted in Table 16.

**Table 16. Summary of Ratings for FSS Review**

Rating	Were agency policy and procedures followed?
<i>Strength</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	5 (100%)
Total	5 (100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	<b>0 (0%)</b>

Information for ratings was obtained by reviewers through case file documentation, which includes the use of CAPSS. In five cases reviewed, there were pieces of agency policy and procedures that were not followed. Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* include:

- Statements documented in the Risk Matrix were contradictory to the documentation of the allegations, with no reconciliation of facts documented. (4 cases)
- Some of the areas in the Risk Matrix did not include statements to address all documented allegations made by the reporter, with no reconciliation of facts documented. (4 cases)
- The Maltreatment Tab documentation was not accurately completed by the agency based upon other documentation in the record, with no reconciliation of facts documented. (1 case)
- Per the documentation of the allegations made and the case file, the allegation should have met the legal definition of maltreatment, but the agency failed to accept the report with no documented reconciliation of the facts. (1 case)



## SECTION VI: VOLUNTARY CASE MANAGEMENT REVIEW

A review of five allegations was completed to determine whether agency policy and procedures were followed for reports referred to Voluntary Case Management (VCM). The reports were randomly selected from the list of reports referred to a Community-Based Prevention Services Provider by the county during the period under review. The *South Carolina Department of Social Services Quality Assurance Review Community-Based Prevention Services Assessment Instrument* was used to conduct the review. This instrument includes a description of the allegation and sixteen questions regarding the referral to the VCM Community-Based Prevention Services Provider and processes (see Table 17).

**Table 17. Summary of Item Ratings for Assessment**

	Yes	No	NA	Total
1. Illegal substance use alleged AND reason for safety threatened with harm	1	4	0	5
2. Use of CAPSS and/or other systems for prior involvement	5	0	0	5
3a. Did the intake worker thoroughly complete the Sufficiency tab in CAPSS	5	0	0	5
3b. If question 1 or 2 is answered no, did worker provide explanation	0	0	5	5
4a. Maltreatment tab in CAPSS completed	4	1	0	5
4b. If yes to maltreatment, did worker provide an explanation	0	0	5	5
4c. If yes to maltreatment, did supervisor provide additional information	0	0	5	5
5. Existing Safety Factors not seen by intake worker or documented	2	3	0	5
6. Assessment made utilizing SCDSS Risk Matrix	5	0	0	5
7a. Results of SCDSS Risk Matrix contradicted allegation made by reporter	5	0	0	5
7b. Did results fail to include statements to support allegations made by reporter	5	0	0	5
8. Agency contacted collaterals for Community-Based Prevention Services	0	4	1	5
9. Additional intake referral made on same perpetrator AND/OR child	1	4	0	5
10. Family received community-based prevention services	0	1	4	5
11. Community-based provider entered an account in CAPSS	5	0	0	5
12. Family accepted services from Community-Based Prevention Services Provider	3	2	0	5

\*Note: A single case may have more than one issue identified.

The percentage of *strengths* is also calculated for the cases reviewed. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Findings of these reviews are noted in Table 18.

**Table 18. Summary of Ratings for VCM Review**

Rating	Were agency policy and procedures followed?
<i>Strength</i>	1 (20%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	4 (80%)
Total	5 (100%)
% <i>Strengths</i>	<b>1 (20%)</b>

Information for ratings was obtained by reviewers through case file documentation, which includes the use of CAPSS. In four cases reviewed pieces of agency policy and procedures were not followed. Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* include:

- Statements documented in the Risk Matrix were contradictory to the documentation of the allegations, with no reconciliation of facts documented. (4 cases)
- Some of the areas in the Risk Matrix did not include statements to address all documented allegations made by the reporter, with no reconciliation of facts documented. (4 cases)
  - Case documentation indicated that the child's living conditions were hazardous and that the caregiver was not capable of applying basic safety measures for the child, but the agency failed to include this information in the intake assessment. (1 case)
- Per the documentation of the allegations made and the case file, the allegation should have met the legal definition of maltreatment, but the agency failed to accept the report with no documented reconciliation of the facts. (1 case)
- Documentation did not verify that all indicated and appropriate collateral contacts were made. (1 case)

## **APPENDIX 1. SUMMARY OF ISSUES CAUSING AN *AREA NEEDING IMPROVEMENT* (ANI) RATING FOR APPLICABLE CASES**

The following is an overview of strengths and weaknesses that were found in the cases for Spartanburg County conducted August 11-15, 2014. The period under review was February 1, 2014 – July 31, 2014.

### **Positives:**

*Items 2 (Repeat Maltreatment)* and *5 (Foster Care reentries)* were identified as *strengths* of the agency; all applicable cases reviewed were rated as *strength* with no *area needing improvement* (ANI).

### **Concerns:**

The following examines the *items* that had the highest ANI ratings.

- *Item 9 (Adoption)* – 5 of 8 (62.5%) applicable cases rated as ANI
  - The agency did not make concerted efforts to achieve adoption in a timely manner. (3 cases) Cases that provided specific reasoning noted the following issues:
    - A child did not have their TPR hearing scheduled during the PUR, making it unlikely that the agency would achieve a finalized adoption within 24 months of the establishment of the goal. (1 case)
  - The agency did not make efforts to file a petition for TPR within the court ordered timeframe of 60 days. (1 case)
  - The agency failed to establish adoption in a timely manner. (2 cases)
    - A child had been in care for 96 months.
    - A child had been in care for four and a half years.
  
- *Item 10 (Other planned permanent living arrangement)* – 1 of 1 (100%) applicable cases rated as ANI
  - Concerted efforts were not made to achieve the goal of other planned permanent living arrangements. (1 case)
    - The child was not placed in a permanent living arrangement.
    - There was no documented agreement for the child’s GAL to serve as the permanent, life-long connection.
  
- *Item 12 (Placement with siblings)* – 3 of 6 (50%) applicable cases rated as ANI

- The agency did not make concerted efforts to place the target child and sibling(s) together. (3 cases)
  - The county had a capacity issue and did not have foster homes who were willing to have the siblings placed together. (3 cases)
  
- *Item 13 (Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care) – 8 of 13 (61.5%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
  - The frequency of the visits with the following family members was not sufficient: (7 cases)
    - Mother (3 cases)
    - Father (3 cases)
    - Sibling(s) (3 cases)
    - Adoptive Father (1 case)
  - The quality of the visits with the following family members was not sufficient: (3 cases)
    - Mother (3 cases)
    - Father (1 case)
  
- *Item 15 (Relative placement) – 7 of 14 (50%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
  - The agency failed to make concerted efforts to identify, locate, and evaluate relatives as potential placements for the target child. (7 cases) Potential placements included:
    - Paternal relatives (4 cases)
    - Maternal and paternal relatives (3 cases)
  
- *Item 16 (Relationship of child in care with parents) – 7 of 11 (63.6%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
  - The agency did not make concerted efforts to promote, support, and maintain positive relationships between the child and family. (7 cases) Specific relationships affected include:
    - Child and father (5 cases)
    - Child and mother (5 cases)
 Specific events noted that the members of the family were not invited to include:
    - Dental appointments (4 cases)
    - Medical appointments (4 cases)
    - Mental health appointments (1 case)
    - Educational events/Extracurricular activities (4 cases)

- *Item 17 (Needs and services of child, parents, & foster parents) – 22 of 30 (73.3%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
  - Assessments were not conducted for the following individuals: (19 cases)
    - Father(s) (16 cases)
    - Mother (10 cases)
    - Child(ren) (2 cases)
    - Step-Father (1 case)
  - Concerted efforts were not made to provide services for the following individuals: (8 cases)
    - Father (6 cases)
    - Mother (4 cases)
    - Child(ren) (2 cases)
  
- *Item 18 (Child & family involvement in case planning) – 20 of 29 (69.0%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
  - The agency failed to make concerted efforts to involve the following people in the case planning process: (20 cases)
    - Father(s) (15 cases)
    - Mother (14 cases)
    - Child(ren) (3 cases)
    - Step-Father (1 case)
  
- *Item 20 (Caseworker visits with parents) – 23 of 27 (85.2%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
  - The frequency of visits between the agency and the following individuals was not sufficient (22 cases)
    - Father(s) (19 cases)
    - Mother (15 cases)
    - Adoptive Father (1 case)
  - The quality of visits between the agency and the following individuals was not sufficient: (10 cases)
    - Mother (9 cases)
    - Father (7 cases)
  
- *Item 22 (Physical health of child) – 14 of 18 (77.8%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
  - Dental health records were not located in the foster care case file. (4 cases)
  - Medical/physical health records were not located in the foster care case file. (5 cases)

- A dental assessment was not conducted when indicated and appropriate. (4 cases)
- The appropriate medical/physical health services were not provided to meet the needs of the target child. (4 cases)
- The agency did not assess the medical/physical health needs of the child. (2 cases)
- The appropriate dental services were not provided to meet the needs of the target child. (1 case)