

Beaufort County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2008

During the week of May 12 - 16, 2008 a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Beaufort County. A sample of open and closed foster care and treatment cases were reviewed. Also reviewed were screened-out intakes, foster home licensing records, and unfounded investigations. Stakeholders interviewed for this review included foster parents, Beaufort DSS supervisors, representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

Period under Review: May 1, 2007 to April 30, 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. Agency data 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.

Beaufort County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2008

Ratings

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

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

The county's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of two items:

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| 1) Timeliness of initiating investigations | Area Needing Improvement |
| 2) Repeat Maltreatment | Strength |

Agency Data				
Performance Measure 1: Initiating CPS Investigations				
Objective: 100% in <= 24 hours (state law)				
	Number of Investigations	Number of Investigations Initiated Timely	Percent of Investigations Initiated Timely	Number of Investigations Above (Below) Objective
State	18,824	17,791	94.5	(896)
Beaufort	362	330	91.16	(32)

Explanation of Item 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all (100%) accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. Agency data indicates that for the 12 month period under review, Beaufort initiated 91.16% of its investigations of alleged abuse and neglect within 24 hours.

Stakeholder Comments: We have received reports of abuse and could not get to the client timely because we had to wait on an interpreter to accompany us. This is an increasing problem because we have such a large and growing Hispanic population.

Beaufort County DSS
 Child Welfare Services Review
 May 2008

Agency Data				
Performance Measure 3: Treatment Cases With No New Indicated Reports – Of all treatment cases that were closed during the year reporting period, what percentage did NOT have a new founded intake within 12 months of the treatment case being closed?				
Objective: $\geq 87.55\%$ Agency Average				
	Number of Treatment Cases Closed	Number of Treatment Cases with no founded intake within 12 months	Percent of Treatment Cases that did not have a new founded intake within 12 months	Number of Cases Above (Below) State Average
State	4,961	4,341	87.50	0
Beaufort	85	78	91.76%	3.6

Explanation of Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment

This is an area of **Strength** for Beaufort DSS. This item measures the occurrence of maltreatment among children under agency supervision, or within a year of having their case closed by the agency. Agency data shows that 92% of the treatment cases were not involved in a subsequent incident of maltreatment. The onsite review confirmed that this is an area of strength for the county.

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

The county’s performance on this outcome is based on the rating of two items:

- 3) Services to family to protect children and prevent removal **Area Needing Improvement**
- 4) Risk of Harm **Area Needing Improvement**

Beaufort County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2008

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Safety Item 3: Services to Family to Protect Children in Home and Prevent Removal.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	100	0	0	7	0
Treatment	5	56	4	44	1	0
Total Cases	8	67	4	33	8	0

Explanation of Item 3: Services to Family to Protect Children and Prevent Removal

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. This item assesses whether services were adequate to protect children in their home and prevent their removal and placement into foster care. Reviewers determined that the removal decision was correct in all of the foster care cases. Reviewers rated 44% of the treatment cases as needing improvement. In those cases the agency failed to assess the needs of alternative caregivers or other adults in the household.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Safety Item 4: Risk of Harm						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	2	20	8	80	0	0
Total Cases	12	60	8	40	0	0

Explanation of Item 4: Risk of Harm

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. This item assesses whether the agency's interventions reduced risks of harm to children. In 80% of the treatment cases, risk of harm was not adequately managed. In those cases, caseworkers clearly described serious risk factors that remained in the home, but failed to take actions needed to reduce those risk factors. Caseworkers consistently failed to assess paramours who lived in the home. In several cases, no criminal background checks were completed on the alternative caregivers and the other adults in the home.

Beaufort County DSS
 Child Welfare Services Review
 May 2008

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

The county's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of six items:

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 5) Foster care re-entries | Strength |
| 6) Stability of foster care placement | Area Needing Improvement |
| 7) Permanency goal for child | Area Needing Improvement |
| 8) Reunification or permanent placement with relatives | Area Needing Improvement |
| 9) Adoption | Area Needing Improvement |
| 10) Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA) | Strength |

Agency Data

Performance Measure 7: Foster Care Re-entries – Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification in the 12 month period prior to the reporting period, the percent that did not re-enter foster care within 12 months of the date of their discharge.

Objective: \geq 90.1% (federal standard)

	Number Children Reunited During Reporting Period	Number of Children Discharged Who Did Not Re-enter Foster Care	Percent of Children Discharged Who Did Not Re-enter Foster Care	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	2,501	2,274	90.92%	20.6
Beaufort	41	39	95.12%	2.1

Explanation of Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries

This is an area of **Strength** for Beaufort DSS. This item measures the frequency of children re-entering foster care within a year of discharge. The federal standard for this measure is that at least 90.1% of children entering foster care not be re-entries within a year of discharge from care. Agency data indicates that, at 95.12% compliance, Beaufort County is above this goal.

Beaufort County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2008

Agency Data				
Performance Measure 6: Stability of Foster Care Placements – Of all children who had been in foster care at least 8 days but less than 12 months from the time of latest removal from home, what percentage had no more than two placement settings?				
Objective: \geq 86% (federal standard)				
	Foster Care Services Open > 7 days and < 12 Months	Number With No More than 2 Placements	Percent with No More than 2 Placements	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	4,213	3,257	77.3%	(395.7)
Beaufort	86	66	76.74%	(8.6)

Explanation of Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placements

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. This item measures the frequency of placement changes for children in foster care, and assesses the reasons for those changes. The standard applied to this item is that at least 86% of children in care experience two or fewer placements during the period under review. Agency data shows that only 77% of the children in care had two or fewer placements during the period under review.

Stakeholder Comments: One issue that definitely needs to be looked at is the length of time children stay in the local emergency shelter. In several cases, children have stayed at the shelter a year or longer.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 7: Permanency Goal for Children						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0

Explanation of Item 7: Permanency Goal for Children

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness of permanency goals for children in foster care and the timeliness of those permanency decisions. In 80% of the cases the agency quickly determined the appropriate goal for the children. However, 20% of the cases needed improvement because the agency and the courts failed to change the child's plan from Return Home to TPR/Adoption when the case history clearly indicated that the change should have occurred.

Beaufort County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2008

Agency Data				
Performance Measure 8: Time to Achieve Reunification – Of all children who were reunited with their parents or caretakers at the time of discharge from foster care, the percentage that were reunited in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal.				
Objective: >= 75.2% (federal standard)				
	Number of Children Returned to Parents/Caretakers	Number of Children Reunited in < 12 Months	Percent of Children Reunited in < 12 Months	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	2,381	1833	76.98%	42.5
Beaufort	58	39	67.24%	(4.6)

Explanation of Item 8: Reunification or Permanent Placement with Relatives

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. This item evaluates the activities and processes necessary to accomplish the goal of reunification with caregivers or placement with relatives. Agency data shows that 67.24% of the children in Beaufort were returned to parents or relatives within 12 months of entering care, which is short of the 75.2% objective. Agency data shows that only 45.71% of Merit Hearings were completed on time. Reviewers found that some Merit Hearings were continued repeatedly, causing some children to be in care for over six months without a Merit Hearing.

Agency Data				
Measure 9: Length of Time to Finalized Adoption – Of all children who left foster care due to finalized adoption during the reporting year, what percentage left foster care within 24 months from the date of their latest removal from home?				
Objective: >= 36.6% (federal standard)				
Report Period: December 1, 2006 to November 30, 2007				
	Number of Adoptions Finalized	Number of Adoptions Finalized < 24 Months	Percent of Adoptions Finalized in < 24 Months	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	436	75	17.20%	(85.6)
Beaufort	12	1	8.33%	(3.4)

Explanation of Item 9: Adoption

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. This item evaluates the process within the child welfare system to achieve timely adoptions for children in foster care. The federal standard is that at least 36.6% of adoptions be completed within 24 months of a child entering care. Agency data indicates that Beaufort County only had 8.33% of their adoptions completed within 24 months. Onsite reviewers saw numerous delays in filing petitions and continued hearings.

Beaufort County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2008

Stakeholder Comments: We have to work an average of five to six hours overtime in this office to handle the load. We need another clerical position to help us out. Because of the growth of Jasper and Beaufort counties, there has been an increase in the number of cases that we are responsible for.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 10: Permanency Goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	100	0	0	8	0

Explanation of Item 10: Permanency Goal of APPLA

This is an area of **Strength** for Beaufort DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness and effectiveness of services provided to children with the permanency plan of APPLA. Reviewers found that children with this plan were receiving appropriate independent living services.

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

The county's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of 6 items:

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 11) Proximity of foster care placement | Strength |
| 12) Placement with siblings in foster care | Strength |
| 13) Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care | Area Needing Improvement |
| 14) Preserving connections | Area Needing Improvement |
| 15) Relative placement | Area Needing Improvement |
| 16) Relationship of child in care with parents | Area Needing Improvement |

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	9	100	0	0	1	0

Explanation of Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement

This is an area of **Strength** for Beaufort County DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep children close enough to their families so that essential relationships can be maintained.

Beaufort County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2008

One measure used to evaluate this item is the percentage of children who are placed within the county. The objective is at least 70% of the children in care be placed within the county. Agency data shows that 78.91% of Beaufort DSS children were placed within the county.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 12: Placement with Siblings						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	88	1	14	3	

Explanation of Item 12: Placement with Siblings in Foster Care

This is an area of **Strength** for Beaufort DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep siblings together when it is appropriate to do so. Reviewers found that, in almost every case, the agency placed siblings together when it was in the children's best interest to be together. Some sibling groups were separated when one or more of the children required a therapeutic placement.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	71	2	29	3	0

Explanation of Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to ensure that visits occur between children in foster care with their siblings and parents. Reviewers found little coordination between county and MTS staff to ensure that children in therapeutic placements visited their siblings who were not in therapeutic placements.

Beaufort County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2008

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 14: Preserving Connections						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	17	5	83	4	0

Explanation of Item 14: Preserving Connections

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. Whereas Item 13 addressed parents and siblings, this item evaluates the agency's efforts to preserve children's connections to the people, places and things that are important to them. Beyond regularly scheduled visits with parents and siblings, reviewers found that the agency failed to pay attention to or document the efforts of foster parents who often took the initiative to preserve relationships between the children in their care and the children's relatives.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 15: Relative Placement						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	40	6	60	0	0

Explanation of Item 15: Relative Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to identify and assess relatives as potential placement resources for children in foster care. In 60% of the cases reviewed, this area needed improvement. Reviewers found instances of relatives who expressed interest in caring for children, but no evidence that those relatives were assessed. Reviewers also found that relatives of the custodial parent (usually the mother) were assessed, but relatives of the non-custodial parent (usually the father) were not assessed.

Beaufort County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2008

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	0	0	4	100	6	0

Explanation of Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to promote a supportive relationship between children in care and their parents, beyond the twice minimum visitation requirement. The cases reviewed revealed that the agency did no more than the minimum required visits even when the children's needs clearly indicated that more contact was required.

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

The agency's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of four items:

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 17) Needs and services of child, parents and caregivers | Area Needing Improvement |
| 18) Child and family involvement in case planning | Area Needing Improvement |
| 19) Worker visits with child | Area Needing Improvement |
| 20) Worker visits with parents | Area Needing Improvement |

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 17: Needs and Services of Child, Parents, Foster Parents						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	0
Treatment	2	20	8	80	0	0
Total Cases	11	55	9	45	0	0

Explanation of Item 17: Needs and Services of Child, Parents and Caregivers

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort 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? In 90% of the foster care cases, this was an area of strength. In 80% of the treatment cases, this was an area needing improvement. The most common deficiencies were, a) failure to address the needs of alternative caregivers, and b) failure to assess non-custodial parents and paramours who were significant persons in the child's life.

Beaufort County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2008

Onsite Review Findings						
Well Being Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	13	7	88	2	0
Treatment	0	0	10	100	0	0
Total Cases	1	6	17	94	0	0

Explanation of Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. Reviewers found that for part of the period under review, involving parents and age-appropriate children in case planning was a rare practice in treatment and foster care cases. Parents rarely knew what their case plans required before showing up for a court hearing. At some point during the period under review, the agency began conducting family meetings to correct this deficiency.

Agency Data				
Well Being Item 19: Face-to-Face Visits with Children (<18 years of age)				
Objective: 100% (Agency Policy)				
Report Period: December 1, 2006 - November 30, 2007				
	Number of Children Under Agency Supervision at Least One Complete Calendar Month	Number of Children Visited Every Month	Percent of Children Visited Every Month	Children Without a Documented Face-to-Face Visit Every Month
Foster Care	95	69	72.63%	(26)
Treatment	269	133	49.44%	(136)

Explanation of Item 19: Face-to-Face Visits with Children

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with children under agency supervision, and evaluates the quality of those visits. Overall, foster care cases rated higher than the treatment cases (foster care - 30% needing improvement). The weakest area was in-home treatment cases, with 90% rated needing improvement. Reviewers found that the content of several visits did not address safety, permanency or well being issues.

Beaufort County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2008

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 20: Worker Visits with Parent(s)						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	50	3	50	4	0
Treatment	1	10	9	90	0	0
Total Cases	8	40	12	60	0	0

Explanation of Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with parents, and evaluates the quality of those visits. For this item, foster care cases rated higher than treatment care cases (treatment cases - 90% needing improvement; foster care cases - 50% needing improvement). In many instances, case records contained no explanation of why the agency did not attempt to involve or visit the fathers of children in care.

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

The county's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of one item:

- 21) Educational need of the child **Strength**

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 21: Educational Needs of Child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	80	1	20	5	0
Treatment	6	100	0	0	4	0
Total Cases	11	92	1	8	0	0

Explanation of Item 21: Educational Needs of the Child

This is an area of **Strength** for Beaufort DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and address the educational needs of children under agency supervision. In 92% of the cases, workers assessed the educational needs of the children during monthly face-to-face visits, and verified the children's educational progress through direct contact with the schools.

Beaufort County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2008

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

The county's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of two items:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 22) Physical health of the child | Area Needing Improvement |
| 23) Mental health of the child | Area Needing Improvement |

Onsite Review Findings

Well Being Item 22: Physical Health of the Child

	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 22: Physical Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and address the physical and dental health needs of children under agency supervision. This was an area of strength for all foster care cases. Deficiencies were evident in 50% of the in-home treatment. In some instances, the problem was a failure to assess the needs of children. In other cases, there was no evidence that caseworkers followed up to determine if the identified medical needs were being addressed.

Onsite Review Findings

Well Being Item 23: Mental Health of the Child

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	100	0	0	5	0
Treatment	3	50	3	50	4	0
Total Cases	8	73	3	27	9	0

Explanation of Item 23: Mental Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Beaufort DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the mental health needs of children under agency supervision. This was an area of strength for all foster care cases. Fifty percent of the treatment cases needed improvement. The deficiencies in this Item and Item 22 above resulted from a combination of overwhelmed supervisors trying to monitor the work of too many inexperienced caseworkers.

Beaufort County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2008

Unfounded Investigations

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

Explanation of Item 24: Unfounded Investigations

This is an area of **Strength** for Beaufort DSS. This item evaluates the agency’s investigative process and determines if decisions were supported by the facts of the cases. The decision in all five cases reviewed was supported by the facts in those cases. In one case, an investigation was not timely due to the delays in obtaining an interpreter for Spanish speaking clients.

Screened Out Intakes

	Yes	No	Cannot Determine
Was the Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	9	0	1
			Not Applicable
Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?	4	5	1
Were Appropriate Referrals Made?	4	4	2

Explanation of Item 25: Screened Out Intakes

This is area of **Strength** for Beaufort DSS. This item evaluates the process by which the agency screens out reports of incidents of abuse and/or neglect to determine if the intakes were appropriately screened out. Nine out of ten intakes were screened out because they did not allege anything that met the legal definition of abuse or neglect. In one case, the agency screened out a report involving domestic violence between the parents with a child in the home having suicidal ideations. In numerous cases, reviewers found that the agency did not contact collaterals like law enforcement and schools before screening out the report.

Beaufort County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2008

Foster Home Licenses

Explanation of Item 26: Foster Home Licenses

This is an area of **Strength** for Beaufort DSS. This item evaluates the process by which the agency ensures that all foster homes comply with licensing requirements. There were no invalid or expired licenses. Some minor areas needing improvement were identified. The two deficiencies most often cited were: 1) failure to see all the adults in the foster home during quarterly visits, and 2) missing sex offender checks on older foster children.

Beaufort County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2008

Beaufort County DSS Summary Sheet					
Performance Item or Outcome		Performance Item Ratings			
		Strength	Area Needing Improvement	N/A*	
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.					
Item 1:	ANI*	Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	7/8 = 88%	1/8 = 12%	12
Item 2:	Str	Repeat maltreatment	20/20= 100%	0	0
Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.					
Item 3:	ANI	Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	8/12 = 67 %	4/12 = 33 %	8
Item 4:	ANI	Risk of harm to child(ren)	12/20 = 60%	8/20 = 40%	0
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.					
Item 5:	Str*	Foster care re-entries	3/3 = 100%	0	7
Item 6:	ANI*	Stability of foster care placement	7/10 = 70%	3/10 = 30%	0
Item 7:	ANI	Permanency goal for child	8/10 = 80%	2/10 = 20 %	0
Item 8:	ANI	Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	2/3 = 67%	1/3= 33 %	7
Item 9:	ANI	Adoption	1/6 = 17%	5/6 = 83%	4
Item 10:	Str	Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	2/2 = 100%		8
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.					
Item 11:	Str	Proximity of foster care placement	9/9 = 100%	0	1
Item 12:	Str	Placement with siblings	6/7 = 88 %	1/7 = 14 %	3
Item 13:	ANI	Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	5/7 = 71 %	2/7 = 29 %	3
Item 14:	ANI	Preserving connections	1/6 = 17%	5/6 = 83 %	4
Item 15:	ANI	Relative placement	4/10 = 40 %	6/10 = 60 %	0
Item 16:	ANI	Relationship of child in care with parents	0	5/5 = 100 %	5
Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.					
Item 17:	ANI	Needs and services of child, parents, caregiver	11/20 = 55%	9/20 = 45%	0
Item 18:	ANI	Child and family involvement in case planning	1/18 = 6%	17/18 = 94%	2
Item 19:	ANI	Worker visits with child	8/20 = 40 %	12/20 = 60%	0
Item 20:	ANI	Worker visits with parent(s)	4/16 = 25%	12/16= 75 %	4
Item 21:	Str	Educational needs of the child	11/12 = 92%	1/12 = 8%	5
Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.					
Item 22:	ANI	Physical health of the child	15/20 = 75%	5/20 = 25%	0
Item 23:	ANI	Mental health of the child	8/11 = 73%	3/11 = 27 %	9

The objective is that 90% of cases be rated "Strength".

Str = Strength

ANI = Area Needing Improvement

* = Rating based on agency data, not onsite review findings