

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

During the week of September 17-21, 2007, a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Orangeburg 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, Orangeburg DSS staff, representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

Period Under Review: September 1, 2006 to August 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.

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

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 **Strength**
- 2) Repeat Maltreatment **Strength**

Agency Data				
Measure S1.1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations on Reports of Child Maltreatment				
Data Time Period: June 1, 2006 to May 31, 2007				
Objective: 100% in <= 24 hours (state law)				
	Number of Reports Accepted	Number of Investigations Initiated Timely	Percent of Investigations Initiated Timely	Number of Investigations Above (Below) Objective
State	17,903	17,527	98.2	(331)
Orangeburg	66	66	66	0

Explanation of Item 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations

This is an area of **Strength** for Orangeburg DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. Agency data shows that, for the 12 month period under review, Orangeburg initiated all of the investigations of alleged abuse and neglect within 24 hours.

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

Agency Data

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 6 month period.

Indicated Report Between August 1, 2006 to July 31, 2007

Objective: <= 6.1% (federal Standard)

	Number of Child Victims	Number of Child Victims In Another Founded Report	Percent of Children in Another Founded Report	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	10,855	95	9,769.5	567.2
Orangeburg	89	4	80.1	1.4

Explanation of Item 2: Recurrence Maltreatment

This is an area of **Strength** for Orangeburg DSS. This item measures the occurrence of maltreatment among children under agency supervision during the period under review. The federal standard is that less than 6.1% of children experience repeat maltreatment. Agency data and onsite review findings indicate a low incidence of children experiencing repeated or ongoing maltreatment.

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**

Onsite Review Findings

Safety Item 3: Services to Family to Protect Children in Home and Prevent Removal

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	100	0	0	8	0
Treatment	6	60	4	40	0	0
Total Cases	8	67	4	33	8	0

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg DSS. This item measures whether services were adequate to protect children (in the home) and prevent their removal and placement into foster care. All foster care cases were rated an area of strength. Reviewers determined that the decision to remove those children from their homes and place them in foster care was consistently correct. However, 40% of the treatment cases needed improvement. The deficiencies involved failure to properly assess or provide support to alternative caregivers.

Onsite Review Findings

Safety Item 4: Risk of Harm

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	1	10	9	90	0	0
Total Cases	11	55	9	45	0	0

Explanation of Item 4: Risk of Harm

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg DSS. This item assesses whether the agency's interventions reduced risks of harm to children. Reviewers found that children in foster care were not at risk of harm. However, in 90% of the treatment cases, risk of harm was not reduced. In many treatment cases children were placed with alternative caregivers with no background checks being conducted to ensure safety of the placement. The risks posed by paramours and other adults living in the home were overlooked in the majority of treatment cases.

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 | Strength |
| 7) Permanency goal for child | Area Needing Improvement |
| 8) Reunification or permanent placement with relatives | Strength |
| 9) Adoption | Area Needing Improvement |
| 10) Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA) | Area Needing Improvement |

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

Agency Data

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.

Objective: <= 8.6% (federal standard)

	Number Children Entering Care 8/01/06 to 7/31/07	Number That Were returned Home Within The Past 12 Months From Previous Foster Care Episode	Percent That Were Returned Home Children Within the Past 12 months From previous Foster Care Episode	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,703	222	3,384	96.5
Orangeburg	45	4	41	(.1)

Onsite Review Findings

Permanency Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	100	0	0	7	0

Explanation of Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries

This is an area of **Strength** for Orangeburg 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 no more than 8.6% of children entering foster care be re-entries within a year of discharge from care. Orangeburg County met both the federal and the onsite review standards for this measure.

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

Agency Data				
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 no more than 2 placement settings.				
Objective: <= 86.7% (federal standard)				
	Number of Children In Care Less Than 12 Months	Number of Children With No More Than 2 Placements	Percent of Children With No More Than 2 Placements Settings	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	4,284	3,441	3,714	(273.2)
Orangeburg	50	46	43	2.7

Onsite Review Findings						
Permanency Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placement.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0

Explanation of Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placement

This is an area of **Strength** for Orangeburg DSS. This item measures the frequency of placement changes for children in foster care, and assesses the reasons for those changes. The federal standard for this measure is that at least 86.7% of the children in care have no more than two placements in the past year. Agency data shows that 46 of 50 (92%) children in foster care in Orangeburg County had less than two placements. The cases reviewed onsite were all rated an area of strength for this item.

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

Agency Data				
Measure P1.5: Permanency Goal for Child – 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.				
Objective: > = 53% (DSS objective)				
	Children in Care At Least 15 of Last 22 Months 8/1/06/06 to 7/31/07	Number Children With TPR Complaint	Percent of Children With TPR Complaint	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,597	1,659	46.1	(247.4)
Orangeburg	62	36	58.1	3.1

Onsite Review Findings						
Permanency Item 7: Permanency Goal for Children.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	70	3	30	0	0

Explanation of Item 7: Permanency Goal for Children

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness of permanency goals for children in foster care and the timeliness of those permanency decisions. To meet the agency objective for this item, 53% or more of the children in care 15 of the most recent 22 months must have a TPR petition filed. The agency met the outcome standard for this performance item in that 58.1% of the children in care 15 of the most recent 22 months had a TPR petition filed. However, onsite reviewers determined that in 30% of the cases, the agency took too long to establish the child’s goal. The most common delay was in the time it took the agency to change the case plan from return home to TPR/Adoption when the parents had a well established history of non-compliance with their treatment plan.

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

Agency Data				
Measure P1.3: Length of Time Until Reunification. Of all children who were reunified with their parent(s) or caretaker(s) at the time of discharge from foster care, what percentage were reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home?				
Objective: $\geq 76.2\%$ (federal standard)				
	Number of Children Returned to Parent(s)/Caretaker(s) Aug 1, 2006 - July 31, 2007	Number of Children Returned to Parent(s)/Caretaker(s) after in Care < 12 Months	Percent of Children Returned to Parent(s)/Caretaker(s) after in Care < 12 Months	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	2,279	1,915	84.03	178.4
Orangeburg	34	29	85.29	3.1

Explanation of Item 8: Reunification or Permanent Placement with Relatives

This is an area of **Strength** for Orangeburg DSS. This item evaluates the activities and process to accomplish the goal of reunification with caregivers or placement with relatives. Findings from the onsite review identified only one case that needed improvement due to delays surrounding an out-of-state home study request.

Agency Data				
Measure P1.4: Length of Time to Achieve Adoption – 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.				
Objective: $\leq 32\%$ (federal standard)				
	Number of Children With Finalized Adoption Within Past 12 Months	Number of Children Where Adoption Was Finalized Within 24 Months of Entering Care	Percent of Children Whose Adoption Was Finalized in < 24 Months	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	383	58	122.56	(64.6)
Orangeburg	6	0	1.9	(1.9)

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 9: Adoption						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	50	4	50	2	0

Explanation of Item 9: Adoption

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg 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 32% of adoptions be completed within 24 months of a child entering care. Agency data shows that all of the adoptions completed in the past 12 months took more than 24 months to complete. Onsite reviewers looked at the cases of eight children with a plan of adoption and found significant problems in the process of completing those adoptions. There were delays in filing petitions, continued hearings, and waiting too long before changing the plan from return home to TPR/Adoption.

Agency Data				
Measure P1.6: Permanency Goal of “Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement”				
– 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.				
Objective: <=15% (DSS objective)				
	Number of Children In Care at Least One Day 8/01/06 – 7/31/07	Number of Children In Care With Permanent Plan “Alternate Planned Living Arrangement”	Percent of Children with Permanency Plan of Alternate Planned Living Arrangement	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	8,771	1,518	17.3	(202)
Orangeburg	110	25	22.7	(8.5)

Percent of Children in Foster Care by Age			
	Ages 0 to 5	Ages 6 to 12	Over 12
State	33.5	26.5	40.1
Orangeburg	38.6	28.6	32.9

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

Explanation of Item 10: Permanency Goal of APPLA

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness and effectiveness of services provided to children with the permanency plan of APPLA. One standard applied to this objective is that no more than 15% of the children in foster care should have this plan. Almost 23% of the children in foster care in Orangeburg County have this plan. The disproportionate number of children with the plan of APPLA cannot be explained by the number of older children in care because Orangeburg County has a smaller percentage of children over age 12 (32.9%) than the state average (40.1%).

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

This outcome is based on the rating of 6 items:

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 11) Proximity of foster care placement | Strength |
| 12) Placement with siblings in foster care | Area Needing Improvement |
| 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 |

Agency Data				
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.				
Objective: >=70% (DSS objective)				
	Number of Children In Care 8/1/06 – 7/31/07	Number of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Percent of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	6,122	3,847	62.8	(438.4)
Orangeburg	104	87	83.7	14.2

Explanation of Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement

This is an area of **Strength** for Orangeburg DSS. This item evaluates the agency’s efforts to keep children close enough to their families so that essential relationships can be maintained. 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 83.7% of Orangeburg County children are placed within the county.

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

The onsite review confirmed that this is an area of strength. Orangeburg County has 79 foster homes to serve its 70 children in care.

Stakeholder Comment:

Kids are placed close to their home communities except for MTS. Sometimes kids do have to change school districts. Orangeburg is a huge county. DSS tries to keep them in the same school district.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 12: Placement with Siblings						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	57	3	43	3	0

Explanation of Item 12: Placement with Siblings in Foster Care

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep siblings together when it is appropriate to do so. Reviewers determined that in 43% of the cases, the county did not place siblings together when appropriate.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	57	3	43	3	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to ensure that visits occur between children in foster care and their siblings and parents. In 57% of the cases, the agency did an excellent job of arranging for visits between children in foster care and their parents and siblings. However, in 43% of the cases reviewers rated this an area needing improvement. There was little to no coordination between MTS, Adoptions, and the county office whenever those departments managed different members of a sibling group.

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 14: Preserving Connections						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	80	1	20	5	0

Explanation of Item 14: Preserving Connections

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg DSS. This item addresses 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). In 80% of the cases, there were demonstrated efforts to help the children maintain those significant relationships. In one case, there was documentation to indicate that a child had a significant relationship with a relative, but there were no demonstrated efforts to help maintain or preserve that relationship.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 15: Relative Placement						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	70	3	30	0	0

Explanation of Item 15: Relative Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to identify and assess relatives as potential placement resources for children in foster care. In 70% of the cases, 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 30% of the reviewed cases. Reviewers found several cases where maternal relatives were assessed but there was no mention of paternal relatives being considered as potential placement resources.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	50	2	50	6	0

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg 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. Based on findings from the onsite review, 50% of the cases needed improvement. In those cases, additional contact was not made despite the young age of the child and the agency's intention to return the child to its parent.

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

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 Orangeburg 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? This is an area of strength in foster care cases, but an area needing improvement for in-home treatment cases. The most common deficiency was a failure to address the needs of non-custodial parents and alternative caregivers.

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	89	1	11	1	0
Treatment	2	20	8	80	0	0
Total Cases	10	52	9	48	1	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. This is an area of strength for foster care cases, but an area needing improvement for in-home treatment cases. All records contained treatment plans but in treatment cases, most plans appeared to be prepared with little to no involvement by the parents or age appropriate children. Several plans did not include or mention biological fathers.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 19: Worker Visits with Child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0	0
Total Cases	17	85	3	30	0	0

Explanation of Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with children under agency supervision, and evaluates the quality of those visits. This is an area of strength for foster care cases, but an area needing improvement for in-home treatment cases. In 30% of the in-home treatment cases reviewers found that caseworkers failed to properly assess or address safety and risk issues evident in the case, or to discuss treatment goal related matters.

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 20: Worker Visits with Parent(s)						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	71	2	29	3	0
Treatment	4	40	6	60	0	0
Total Cases	9	53	8	47	3	0

Explanation of Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with parents, and evaluates the quality of those visits. Reviewers determined that 29% of foster care cases and 60% of the treatment cases needed improvement because the content of the visits failed to assess risk and safety. In several treatment cases the agency failed to document why it had no contact with the fathers of the children. The non-custodial fathers of those children needed to be contacted because the mothers were not complying with their treatment plan requirements which placed those children at risk of being removed from the home.

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

21) Educational needs of the child

Area Needing Improvement

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 21: Educational Needs of Child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	100	0	0	3	0
Treatment	2	40	3	60	5	0
Total Cases	9	75	3	25	8	0

Explanation of Item 21: Educational Needs of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and attend to the educational needs of children under agency supervision. This was an area of strength for all of the foster care cases. In 60% of treatment cases, this area needed improvement because identified school issues were not consistently monitored or followed up on when a problem was identified.

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

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

- 22) Physical health of the child
- 23) Mental health of the child

Area Needing Improvement
Area Needing Improvement

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 22: Physical Health of the Child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	67	3	33	1	0
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0	0
Total Cases	13	68	6	32	1	0

Explanation of Item 22: Physical Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg DSS. This item evaluates the agency’s ability to assess and address the physical and dental health needs of children under agency supervision. For children from 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. Both foster care and treatment cases needed improvement in this area because 32% of the cases contained no evidence that the medical needs of the children were assessed or addressed.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 23: Mental Health of the Child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	100	0	00	2	0
Treatment	1	20	4	80	5	0
Total Cases	9	70	4	30	7	0

Explanation of Item 23: Mental Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg 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 foster care, but an area needing improvement for in-home treatment cases. Reviewers found that treatment cases involving families with several children in the home did not contain assessments of all the children, to rule-in or rule-out the need for further intervention.

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

Unfounded Investigations

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

Explanation of Item 24: Unfounded Investigations

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg DSS. This item evaluates the effectiveness of the agency’s investigative process and determines if its decisions were supported by the facts of the cases. In one case, the assessment was inadequate because all of the relevant parties were not interviewed. In that same case, the agency did not have sufficient information from the assessment to support its decision to unfound the case for abuse or neglect.

Screened Out Intakes

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

Explanation of Item 25: Screened Out Intakes

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Orangeburg DSS. This item evaluates the effectiveness of the process by which the agency screens out reports of incidents that the agency does not have the legal authority to investigate. Although the decision to screen out seven of the ten intakes reviewed was appropriate, two of the intakes clearly should have been accepted for investigation.

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

Foster Home Licenses

Explanation of Item 26: Foster Home Licenses

This is an area of **Strength** for Orangeburg 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.

Orangeburg County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
Final Report

Orangeburg County DSS Combined Foster Care & Treatment					
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:	Str	Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	9/9 = 100%	0	11
Item 2:	Str	Repeat maltreatment	14/17= 82%	3/17 = 18%	3
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	8/14= 57%	6/14 = 43%	61
Item 4:	ANI	Risk of harm to child(ren)	11/20 = 55%	9/20 = 45%	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:	Str	Stability of foster care placement	10/10 = 100%	0	0
Item 7:	ANI	Permanency goal for child	7/10 = 70%	3/10 = 30%	0
Item 8:	Str	Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	0	1/1 = 100%	9
Item 9:	ANI	Adoption	4/8=50%	4/8= 50%	2
Item 10:	ANI	Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	1/1 = 100%	0	9
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.					
Item 11:	Str	Proximity of foster care placement	7/7 = 100%	0	3
Item 12:	ANI	Placement with siblings	4/7 = 57%	3/7 = 43%	3
Item 13:	ANI	Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	4/7 = 57%	3/7 = 43%	3
Item 14:	ANI	Preserving connections	4/5 = 80%	1/5 = 20%	5
Item 15:	ANI	Relative placement	7/10 = 70%	3/10 = 30%	0
Item 16:	ANI	Relationship of child in care with parents	2/4= 50%	2/4 = 50%	6
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	10/19=53%	9/19 = 47%	1
Item 19:	ANI	Worker visits with child	17/20 = 85%	3/20 = 15%	0
Item 20:	ANI	Worker visits with parent(s)	9/17= 53%	8/17= 47%	3
Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.					
Item 21:	ANI	Educational needs of the child	9/12= 75%	3/12=25%	8
Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.					
Item 22:	ANI	Physical health of the child	13/19 = 68%	6/19 = 32%	1
Item 23:	ANI	Mental health of the child	9/13= 69%	4/13 = 31%	7

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