

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

During the week of June 4 - 8, 2007, a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Richland County. A sample of foster care and treatment cases, screened out intakes, foster home licensing records, and unfounded investigations were reviewed. Stakeholders interviewed for this review included foster parents, Richland DSS supervisors, representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

**Period included in Case Record Review: June 1, 2006 to May 31, 2007**

**Period included in Outcome Measures: June 1, 2006 to May 31, 2007**

**Purpose**

The Department of Social Services engages in a review of child welfare services in each county to:

- a) Determine to what degree services are delivered in compliance with federal and state laws and agency policy; and
- b) Assess the outcomes for children and families engaged in the child welfare system.

State law (§43-1-115) states, in part:

The state department shall conduct, at least once every five years, a substantive quality review of the child protective services and foster care programs in each county and each adoption office in the State. The county's performance must be assessed with reference to specific outcome measures published in advance by the department.

The information obtained by the child welfare services review process will:

- a) Give county staff feedback on the effectiveness of their interventions.
- b) Direct state office technical assistance staff to assist county staff with their areas needing improvement.
- c) Inform agency administrators of which systemic factors impair county staff's ability to achieve specific outcomes.
- d) Direct training staff to provide training for county staff specific to their needs.

**Quantitative and Qualitative Data Sources**

The county-specific review of child welfare services is both quantitative and qualitative.

The review is **quantitative** because it begins with an analysis of every child welfare outcome report for that county for the period under review. The outcome reports reflect the performance of the county in all areas of the child welfare program: Child Protective Services (CPS) Intake, CPS Investigations, CPS In-Home Treatment, Foster Care, Managed Treatment Services (MTS), and Adoptions.

The review is **qualitative** because it assesses the quality of the services rendered and the effectiveness of those services. The review seeks to explain why a county's performance data looks the way it does.

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

**Ratings**

The standard that must be met for all items reviewed onsite is 90%. Each outcome report has its own standard. To be rated a **Strength** most items must meet both the qualitative onsite review standard **and** the quantitative outcome report standard.

**Section One**

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

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

**Measure S1.1: Timeliness of initiating investigations** on reports of child maltreatment  
Data Time Period: 6/1/06 to 5/31/2007

	Number of Reports Accepted	Number of Investigations Initiated Timely	Number of Investigations Objective 100%*	Number of Investigations Above (Below) Objective
State	17,409	16,998	17,409	(411)
Richland	1,301	1,286	1,301	15

\*This standard is based on state law. It is not a federally established objective.

**Site Visit Findings** Performance Item Ratings

**Safety Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment.**

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	100	0	0	8	
Treatment	7	87.5	1	12.5%	2	
Total Cases	9	90	1	10%	10	

**Explanation of Item 1**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. The outcome report generated by CAPSS indicates that for the 12 month period under review, Richland County initiated 98.8% of the investigations of alleged abuse and neglect within 24 hours. The objective for this item is 100%.

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

**Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

**Measure S1.2: Recurrence of Maltreatment** – Of all children who were victims of indicated reports of child abuse and/or neglect during the reporting period, the percent having another indicated report within a subsequent six month period.

Indicated Reports Between 6/1/06 to 7/31/07

	Number of Child Victims	Number of Child Victims In Another Founded Report	Number of Children Objective ≤ 90%	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	10,489	84	9440.1	555.8
Richland	571	0	468.9	34.8

Note: This is a federally established objective.

**Onsite Review Findings** Performance Item Ratings

**Safety Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment**

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	100	0	0	4	0
Treatment	10	100	0	0	0	0
Total Cases	16	100	0	0	4	0

**Explanation of Item 2**

This is an area of **Strength** for Richland DSS. This item measures the frequency with which children under agency supervision experience additional maltreatment. The outcome report counts cases with additional indicated reports of maltreatment within the period under review. However, onsite reviewers use information documented in the case file to determine if the children under agency care are experiencing additional abuse or neglect, whether that additional abuse results in another indicated report or not. Both foster care and treatment cases were rated strength with a 100% rating.

**Section two**

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

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

<b>Onsite Review Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Safety Item 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal.</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	0	0	1	100	9	0
Treatment	8	80	2	20	0	0
Total Cases	8	73	3	27	9	0

**Explanation of Item 3**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This item measures whether services were adequate to protect children (in the home) and prevent their removal. This rating is based on the findings of the onsite review (no CAPSS data to track this item). The decisions made to remove children from their homes and place them in foster care were consistently correct. Twenty percent of the treatment cases were rated area needing improvement. As an example, in one treatment case, a child was placed with an alternate caregiver and there was no documentation of a safety plan having been developed.

**Stakeholder Comment:** “Most workers focus on reunification, follow guidelines and look at precipitating factors. However, if there is a long history of drug use or anger problems and the parent completes treatment, often the parent still doesn’t know how to parent or cope with problems effectively. The parent is helpless because they can’t beat the kids anymore. Parents allege that DSS takes away their tool to discipline, corporal punishment.”

<b><u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u></b>				
Measure S2.2: <b>Risk of harm to child</b> – Of all unfounded investigations during the reporting period, the percent receiving subsequent reports within six months of the initial report.				
	Number Alleged Child Victims in an Unfounded Report 6/1/06 to 5/31/07	Number With Another Report Within 6 Months of Unfounded Determination	Number of Cases Met Objective $\geq 91.50\%$ *	Number of Cases Above (Below) Objective
State	14,116	1,155	12.916	44.9
Richland	1,141	102	1,044	5

\*This is a DSS established objective.

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

<b>Onsite Review Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Safety Item 4: Risk of harm.</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	0
Total Cases	15	75	5	25	0	0

**Explanation of Item 4**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This item measures if the agency's interventions reduced risk of harm to children. This is determined by outcome data and findings from the onsite review. The outcome report indicates that the county missed this item by five cases. Onsite reviewers determined that in 100% of the foster care cases, risk of harm was adequately reduced. However, risk of harm was reduced in only 50% of the treatment cases. For example, in one case, a parent had unrestricted access to their children despite the agency having knowledge that the parent was not complying with their treatment plan. Consistent problems were noted with alternate caregivers because there was no documentation of background checks being conducted or efforts to ensure that the placement is safe and adequate.

**Stakeholder Comment:** "DSS is often held back by legal aspects, by what happens in court. Some parents show up once every six months when their rights are threatened. As long as they are still in the picture, and they tell the child they are coming home soon, the child may not be able to move on in their life or in therapy, as the consequences can be bad if they disclose anything about the parents and have to return home to them."

---

**Section Three**

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

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

**Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

Measure P1.1: **Foster Care Re-entries** – Of all children who entered care during the year under review, the percent that re-entered foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode.

	Number Children Entering Care 6/01/06 to 5/31/07	Number That Were returned Home Within The Past 12 Months From Previous Foster Care Episode	Number of Children Objective $\geq 91.40\%*$	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,670	253	3,354	62.6
Richland	307	30	280.5	(3.6)

\*This is a federally established objective.

**Onsite Review Findings** Performance Item Ratings

**Permanency Item 5:** Foster care re-entries.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	100	0	0	9	0

**Explanation of Item 5**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This item tracks whether children re-entered foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode. In this area there is a need for improvement based on the data in CAPSS. The outcome measure (P1.1) indicates that Richland County missed the agency goal by five youth.

**Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

Measure P1.2: **Stability of Foster Care Placement** – Of all children who have been in foster care less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home, the percent that had not more than 2 placement settings.

	Number of Children In Care Less Than 12 Months	Number of Children With No More Than 2 Placements	Number of Children Objective $\geq 86.70%*$	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	4,260	3,418	3,693	(275.4)
Richland	385	274	334	(59.8)

Note: This is a federally established objective.

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

<b>Onsite Review Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 6:</b> Stability of foster care placement.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0

**Explanation of Item 6**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. The federal standard for stability of foster care placement is at least 86.7% of the children in care have less than two placements in the past year. The outcome report shows that 274 of 385 (71.7%) children in foster care in Richland County had less than two placements. Findings from the onsite review concur with the outcome data, improvement is needed in this area.

<b><u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u></b>				
(Measure P1.5) <b>Permanency Goal for Child</b> – Of all children who have been in foster care for 15 of the most recent 22 months, the percent for which a Termination of Parental Rights (TPR) petition has been filed.				
	Children in Care At Least 15 of Last 22 Months 6/1/06/06 to 5/31/07	Number Children With TPR Complaint	Number of Children Objective >= 53.00%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,620	1,646	1918.1	(272.6)
Richland	322	131	170.66	(39.7)

\*This is DSS established objective. The federal agency, Administration for Children and Families, gathers data on this measure, but has not established a numerical objective.

<b>Onsite Review Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 7:</b> Permanency goal for children.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	5	5	5	0	0

**Explanation of Item 7**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. To meet the criteria established in the outcome report, 53% or more of the children in care 15 of the most recent 22 months must have a TPR petition filed. To measure permanency, the outcome report and the onsite reviewers consider related, but different information to rate this item. In Richland County 40.7% of the children in care (15 of the most recent 22 months) had a TPR petition filed.

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

Onsite reviewers determined that in 50% of the cases, the agency took too long to establish the child's goal. As an example, in one case, reunification with the biological mother was the plan despite her prior involvement with DSS (TPR of two older children) and documentation to indicate that the mother was not complying with her treatment plan. Another issue was delays in proceeding with a child's concurrent plan.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 8:</b> Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	0	0	3	100	7	0

**Explanation of Item 8**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. To meet the federally established outcome criteria, at least 76.20% of children returned to their parents from foster care must be returned within 12 months of their removal from home. This rating is based on findings from the onsite review of two cases in which the stated goal was not appropriate for the child.

<b><u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u></b>				
Measure P1.4: <b>Length of Time to Achieve Adoption</b> – Of all children who exited from foster care during the year under review to a finalized adoption, the percent that exited care in less than 24 months from the time of the latest removal from home.				
	Number of Children With Finalized Adoption W/in Past 12 Months	Number of Children Where Adoption Was Finalized Within 24 Months of Entering Care	Number of Children Objective $\geq 32.00\%*$	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	387	60	123.84	(63.8)
Richland	12	1	3.84	(2.8)

Note: This is a federally established objective.



**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

<b>Onsite Review Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 9:</b> Adoption. *Objective 32% of children with plan of adoption are finalized within 24 months.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	25	3	75	6	0

**Explanation of Item 9**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This item measures whether or not adoptions were completed within 24 months of the most recent foster care placement. This rating is based on the outcome report and findings from the onsite review. Onsite reviewers determined that in 100% of the cases, there were delays in filing petitions, continued hearings, and waiting too long before changing the plan from return home to TPR/Adoption.

<b>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</b>				
Measure P1.6: <b>Permanency Goal of “Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement”</b> – Of all children in foster care, the percent with a permanency goal of emancipation (Indep Liv Services) or a planned permanent living arrangement other than adoption, guardianship, or return to family.				
	Number of Children In Care at Least One Day 11/01/05 – 10/31/06	Number of Children In Care With Permanent Plan “Other Planned Living Arrangement”	Number of Children Objective >= 85.00%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	8,747	1,521	7,434	(209)
Richland	357	32	303.4	21.6

\*This is a DSS established objective.

<b>Onsite Review Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 10:</b> Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	100	0	0	8	0

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

**Explanation of Item 10**

This is an area of **Strength** for Richland DSS. The standard for this item is that no more than 15% of the children in foster care should have the plan, Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA). Based on the outcome report and findings from the onsite review only two cases were identified with a permanent plan of Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement. In the two cases adequate and appropriate services were provided to help achieve the goal.

**Section Four**

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

**Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

Measure P2.1: **Proximity to Home of Foster Care Placement** – Of all children in foster care during the reporting period (excluding MTS and Adoptions children), the percent placed within their county of origin.

	Number of Children In Care 6/1/06 – 5/31/07	Number of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Percent of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Number of Children Objective >= 70.00%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	6,683	4,149	62.1	4,678.1	(529.1)
Richland	585	487	73	409.5	12

\*This is a DSS established objective.

**Explanation Item 11**

This is an area of **Strength** for Richland DSS. To meet this objective 70% or more of the children in care must be placed within the county. The outcome report shows that 73% of Richland County children are placed within the county. The onsite review confirmed that this is an area of strength.

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

<b>Onsite Review Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 12: Placement with siblings</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	33	2	67	7	0

**Explanation of Item 12**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This item addresses the agency's ability to keep siblings together when it is in their best interest to be placed together. This determination is based on findings from the onsite review (no outcome data available for this item). Reviewers determined that in 67% of the cases, the county did not place siblings together when appropriate.

<b>Onsite Review Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	0	0	5	100	5	0

**Explanation Item 13**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This item assesses whether visits were provided to the parents and siblings in foster care. In five cases, some visitation was provided but the lack of consistency of the visits and the lack of documentation to determine why a visit was not provided is the rationale for the rating.

<b>Site Visit Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 14: Preserving connections</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	85	1	15	3	0

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

**Explanation of Item 14**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This item measures the agency's ability to preserve a child's connection to the people, places and things that are important to them (while the child is in foster care). Based on findings from the onsite review, in 85% of the cases, there were demonstrated efforts to help the child maintain those significant relationships. However, in one case, there was documentation to indicate that a child had a relationship with a friend of the family and there were no demonstrated efforts to help maintain or preserve that relationship.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 15: Relative placement</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	57	3	43	3	0

**Explanation of Item 15**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This item addresses the agency's effectiveness in identifying and assessing the relatives of children in foster care as possible caregivers. In 57% of the cases reviewed it was evident that all known paternal and maternal relatives were assessed as potential placements for the children in foster care. Identifying relatives as potential placement resources was not evident in 43% of the reviewed cases. Even when relatives expressed an interest in caring for children, there was no documentation to determine if the relatives were assessed. Reviewers also found that maternal relatives were assessed but there was no mention of paternal relatives being considered as potential placement resources.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	33	2	67	7	0

**Explanation Item 16**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This item addresses the agency's effectiveness in promoting or maintaining a strong emotionally supportive relationship between children in care and their parents beyond the twice monthly visitation requirement. Agency policy encourages this additional contact when appropriate. Based on findings from the onsite review, 67% of the cases needed improvement. In several cases, additional contact was not made despite the child having a permanent plan of reunification with a parent.

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

**Section Five**

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

**Site Visit Findings** Performance Item Ratings

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

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	50	5	50	0	0
Treatment	1	10	9	90	0	0
Total Cases	6	30	14	70	0	0

**Explanation of Item 17**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This item asks two questions: 1) Were the needs of the child, parents, and caregivers assessed, and 2) Did the agency take steps to meet the identified needs? Based on findings from the onsite review, five of 10 foster care cases and nine of 10 treatment cases needed improvement. There were numerous problems identified which include: failing to provide services for an identified need, not addressing the needs of all relevant parties – particularly non-custodial parents and alternative caregivers. Other cases focused on the mother and victim child, but failed to assess the father and/or other children in the home.

**Stakeholder Comments:** “Most foster parents don’t want to give up, but we need help to meet the needs of children.”

“When kids are occupied, they stay out of trouble. They need to be occupied well in the summer and they need to have learning experiences that help bridge one school term to another. This is one of the biggest issues – not having enough available for the children in the summer.”

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Well Being Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	50	4	50	2	0
Treatment	4	40	6	60	0	0
Total Cases	8	44	10	56	2	0

**Explanation of Item 18**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This item measures whether parents and children are actively involved in the case planning process. Based on the onsite review, in 50% of the foster care cases and 60% of the treatment cases, this area needs improvement. All records contained treatment plans, but reviewers consistently could not identify documentation to determine that all involved parties were actively involved in helping develop the treatment plan. Another consistent issue was the lack of involvement of the fathers. According to staff, the county conducts family meetings but reviewers were not able to verify this in the documentation.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Well Being Item 19: Worker visits with child</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	4	40	6	60	0	0
Total Cases	14	70	6	30	0	0

**Explanation of Item 19**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This rating is based on two questions: 1) Were Richland DSS staff visiting children according to policy; and 2) Did the visits focus on issues related to the treatment plan? According to the onsite review, in 100% of the foster care cases this item was rated strength. This area needed improvement in 60% of the treatment cases, due to visits not adequately assessing risk and safety issues or discussing treatment goals. In numerous treatment cases, contacts with all the children in the home were not documented. This rating is also based on data from CAPSS. A contributing factor for difficulties with this outcome may be attributed to the large turnover of caseworkers with 46% of the Human Services staff employed less than 12 months (excluding Foster Home Licensing staff).

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

<b>Onsite Review Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Well Being Item 20:</b> Worker visits with parent(s)						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	0	0	5	100	5	0
Treatment	2	22	7	78	1	0
Total Cases	2	14	12	86	6	0

**Explanation of Item 20**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This item determines if workers are visiting with the parents of children under agency supervision. Reviewers determined that 50% of foster care cases and 78% of the treatment cases, needed improvement because the content of the visits failed to assess risk and safety. In several treatment cases visits were not consistent. As an example, in one case, a parent had not been visited in seven months.

**Section Six**

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

<b>Onsite Review Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Well Being Item 21:</b> Educational needs of child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	100	0	0	2	0
Treatment	4	57	3	43	3	0
Total Cases	12	80	3	20	5	0

**Explanation of item 21**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This item asks two questions: 1) Did DSS assess the educational needs of the children under their supervision; and 2) Were identified educational needs addressed? The answer to both questions is “Yes” for 100% of the foster care cases reviewed. In 43% of treatment cases, this area needed improvement because of the lack of documentation to verify that school issues were being monitored.

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

**Stakeholder Comment:** “More attention needs to be paid to educational needs. Most of the kids are several grades below where they should be. We have to address those needs. One foster parent sends her kids to USC or Benedict every summer, at her own expense! Most foster parents are asked to assume the costs for school field trips and other related activities. However not all foster parents can afford this added expense. Foster children need to be prepared for success, not for DJJ.”

**Section Seven**

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

**Onsite Review Findings** Performance Item Ratings

**Well Being Item 22:** Physical health of the child

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	0
Treatment	3	30	7	70	0	0
Total Cases	12	60	8	40	0	0

**Explanation of Item 22**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This item determines if the physical and dental health needs of children are being assessed and appropriately met. For children age birth to seven years, there should be documentation to confirm that an annual physical examination was conducted. For older children, physicals examinations are to be conducted at least one time every two years. In 90% of the foster care cases this was rated strength. In 70% of the treatment cases, this area needed improvement due to the lack of documentation to verify that a child’s medical needs and dental needs were assessed.

**Onsite Review Findings** Performance Item Ratings

**Well Being Item 23:** Mental health of the child

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	100	0	00	3	0
Treatment	2	50	2	50	6	0
Total Cases	9	82	2	18	9	0



**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

**Explanation of Item 23**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. This item determines if the mental health needs of children are regularly assessed and addressed as appropriate. In all of the foster care cases, this item was rated strength. In 50% of the treatment cases, this item needed improvement again due to the lack of adequate documentation. For example, in a treatment case, the agency became involved because a relative caregiver fondled a young girl. There was documentation that the victim child was experiencing some behavioral and emotional problems. Despite the agency having been involved for almost a year, the child had not received counseling.

---

**Section Eight – Foster Home Licenses**

This is an area of **Strength** for Richland DSS. This item determines if all licensing requirements are documented and in compliance with established procedures. Onsite reviewers found that all licenses were current and up-to-date. Dictation was entered timely into CAPSS including quarterly visits. Timely supervisory reviews were evident.

**Suggestions for Improvement:**

- Be certain foster fathers are seen during quarterly visits. In several cases, these fathers had not been seen in almost a year.
- Notice of Hearings – Foster parents must receive copies of notices.
- Sex Offender checks for youth ages 12 years and older must be conducted.
- Delays noted between the time the worker submits license and date the county director signs the license (1 month or more).

---

**Section Nine – Unfounded Investigations**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Was the investigation initiated timely?	5	0
Was the assessment adequate?	4	1
Was the decision appropriate?	4	1

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. Onsite reviewers utilize information on file to determine if the decisions being made to unfound cases are appropriate. In one case, the documentation fails to indicate whether all the children involved in the report were interviewed.

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

---

**Section Ten – Screened Out Intakes**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Cannot Determine</b>
Was Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	7	2	1
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?	4	3	3
Were Appropriate Referrals Made?	1	2	7

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Richland DSS. Reviewers utilize information collected at intake to determine if referrals were appropriately screened out for investigation. Although the decision to screen out six of the 10 intakes reviewed was appropriate, improvement needs to be made regarding dictation because reviewers were not able to make a determination in three cases based on the information in the record

**Richland County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
June 2007**

<b>Richland County DSS Combined Foster Care &amp; Treatment Tally</b>			
<b>Performance Item or Outcome</b>	<b>Performance Item Ratings</b>		
	<b>Strength</b>	<b>Area Needing Improvement</b>	<b>N/A*</b>
<b>Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.</b>			
Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	9/10= 90%	1/10=10%	10
Item 2: Repeat maltreatment	16/16= 100%	0	4
<b>Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.</b>			
Item 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	8/11=73%	3/11=27%	9
Item 4: Risk of harm to child(ren)	15/20 = 75%	5/20 = 25%	0
<b>Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.</b>			
Item 5: Foster care re-entries	1/10=10%	9/10=90%	0
Item 6: Stability of foster care placement	8/10 = 80%	2/10=20%	0
Item 7: Permanency goal for child	5/10 =50%	5/10 = 50%	0
Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	0	3/3 = 100%	7
Item 9: Adoption	0	5/5=100%	5
Item 10: Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	2/2=100%	0	8
<b>Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.</b>			
Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement	7/8=87.5%	1/8=12.5%	2
Item 12: Placement with siblings	5/5=100%	0	5
Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	0	5/5=100%	5
Item 14: Preserving connections	6/7 = 86%	1/7=14%	3
Item 15: Relative placement	4/7 = 57%	3/7=43%	3
Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents	1/3=33%	2/3= 67%	7
<b>Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.</b>			
Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, caregiver	6/20 = 30%	14/20 = 70%	0
Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning	8/18=44%	10/18 = 56%	2
Item 19: Worker visits with child	14/20 = 70%	6/20 = 30%	0
Item 20: Worker visits with parent(s)	2/14= 14%	12/14= 86%	6
<b>Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.</b>			
Item 21: Educational needs of the child	12/15=80%	3/15=20%	5
<b>Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.</b>			
Item 22: Physical health of the child	12/20 = 60%	8/20 = 40%	0
Item 23: Mental health of the child	9/11= 82%	2/11 = 18%	9