

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

During the week of June 22 - 26, 2009, a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Anderson 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, foster child, Anderson DSS supervisor and workers, representative from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

Period under Review: July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009

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.

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

Ratings

The standard that must be met for all items reviewed onsite is 95%. 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 | Area Needing Improvement |

Agency Data

Performance Measure 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations on Reports of Child Maltreatment - Of all reports of child maltreatment that were accepted for investigation during the reporting period, what percentage had a dictation type contact of initial contact where the action date is within 24 hours of accepting the report?

Report Period: 05/1/08 to 04/30/09

Objective: 100% in <= 24 hours (state law)

	Number of Investigations	Number of Investigations Initiated Timely	Percent of Investigations Initiated Timely	Numbers of Investigations Above (Below) Objective
State	17,141	16,793	97.97%	(348)
Anderson	1,001	994	99.30%	(7)

Explanation of Item 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations

This is an area of **Strength** for Anderson DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all (100%) accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. Reviewers were able to determine that the seven investigations that appeared to be late were actually initiated timely. The discrepancies were due to data entry errors. Reviewers found that the county office was appropriately assigning risk ratings to its investigations, and that investigations of high risk cases were initiated within two hours.

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

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? Report Period: 05/1/08 to 04/30/09				
Objective: ≥ 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	5,737	5,095	88.81%	
Anderson	246	219	89.02%	0.5

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Safety Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0
Treatment	8	80	2	20	0	0
Total of Cases	16	80	4	20	0	0

Explanation of Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson 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 89.02% of in-home treatment cases closed were not involved in a subsequent indicated incident of maltreatment. Reviewers found that the children in 20% of the foster care and in-home treatment cases experienced maltreatment while under the agency’s protective supervision. Not all of those incidents of maltreatment triggered a new report. Consequently, those incidents were not captured by the agency’s child welfare database CAPSS.

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

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	8	80	2	20	0	0
Total Cases	10	83	2	17	8	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item assesses whether services were adequate to protect children in their home and prevent their removal and placement into foster care. In every foster care case reviewed, reviewers determined that the decision to remove the children from their homes and place them in foster care was appropriate. In 80% of the treatment cases, appropriate services were being offered to safely maintain the children in their home. This is an area needing improvement because of cases with two types of deficiencies: 1) inadequate safety plans, and 2) failure to initiate court action when parents' non-compliance created risks for the children.

Stakeholders Comments: "We need more funds for drug screens because we have a lot of clients that use methamphetamine. Methamphetamine is a big problem in our county and we have very limited resources to work with that population."

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

Onsite Review Findings						
Safety Item 4: Risk of Harm						
	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	15	0	0

Explanation of Item 4: Risk of Harm

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item assesses whether the agency's intervention reduced risk of harm to children. In 100% of the foster care cases reviewed, risk of harm was adequately managed. Reviewers rated 30% of the treatment cases as needing improvement because the agency failed to assess other adults in the home who had an active role in the children's lives, and failed to assess alternate caregivers. In those cases, the agency failed to complete criminal background checks on the alternative caregivers and other adults who live in the home.

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) | Area Needing Improvement |

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

Agency Data				
Performance Measure 7: Foster Children Who do Not Re-Enter Care - Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification in the 12 month period prior to reporting period, what percentage did Not re-enter foster care within 12 months of the date of their discharge from the prior foster care episode.				
Objective: 90.1% (Federal Standard)				
	Number of Foster Children Reunified during Reporting Period	Number of Children Who Did Not Re-enter Foster Care Within 12 Months	Percent of Children Who Did Not Re-Enter Foster Care Within 12 Months	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	2,948	2,712	91.99%	55.9
Anderson	91	84	92.31%	2.0

Explanation of Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries

This is area of **Strength** for Anderson DSS. This item measures the frequency of children re-entering foster care within a year of discharge. To meet the minimum requirement for this item, 90.1% of children must not re-enter foster care within a year of discharge. Agency data shows that 92.31% of the children did not re-enter foster care within 12 months of the date of their discharge from the previous foster care episode.

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, the percentage that had no more than two placements settings.				
Objective: >= 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 Above (Below) Objective
State	3,889	2,929	75.31%	(209.4)
Anderson	173	122	70.52%	(26.8)

Explanation of Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item measures the frequency of placement changes for children in foster care, and assesses the reasons for those changes. The objective for this item is that at least 86% of the children in care have two or fewer placements within 12 months. Agency data shows that 70.52% of Anderson DSS children had two or fewer

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

placements. The instability appears to be related to the fact that Anderson DSS had only 68 foster homes to serve its 295 children. That lack of resources created a reliance on emergency shelters and placements based on bed availability rather than the needs of the child.

Onsite Review Findings

Permanency Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	40	6	60	0	0

Explanation of Item 7: Permanency Goal for Children

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness of permanency goals for children in foster care and the timeliness of those permanency decisions. In 60% of the cases reviewed, the agency took more than 17 months to establish the permanency goal of TPR/Adoption for children after several attempts at reunification failed with the parents. In four of the cases the court did not approve the agency's established goal of TPR/ Adoption, even though the children had been in foster care for more than 15 months. In those cases, the court granted the parents an additional six months to comply with the requirements in their treatment plan. The court's action delayed permanency for those children.

Agency Data

Performance Measure 8: Time to Achieve Reunification – Of all children who were reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of discharge from foster care and had been in care for 8 days or more, what percentage were reunified in less than 12 months from the date of their latest removal from home?

Reporting Period: 05/1/08 to 04/30/09

Objective: >= 75.2% (federal standard)

	Number of Children Returned to Parents/Caretakers	Number of Children Returned to Parents/Caretakers after in Care <12 months	Percent of Children Returned to Parents/Caretakers after in Care < 12 months	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	2,523	1,891	74.95%	(6.3)
Anderson	129	42	32.56%	(55.0)

Explanation of Item 8: Reunification or Permanent Placement with Relatives

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item evaluates the activities and processes necessary to accomplish the goal of reunification with caregivers or placement

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

with relatives. Agency data shows that 32.56% of children who entered foster care in Anderson County returned home within a year. This performance was below the federal standard 75.2%. Stakeholders described a high percentage of clients addicted to methamphetamines and a lack of service providers capable of working with those families.

Agency Data				
Performance Measure 9: Time to Finalize Adoption - Of all children who left foster care due to finalized adoption during the reporting year, what percentage left foster care in less than 24 months from the date of their latest removal from home?				
Reporting Period: April 1, 2008 to March 31, 2009				
Objective: >= 36.6% (National 75 th Percentile)				
	Total Number of Finalized Adoptions	Number of Adoptions Finalized < 24 Months	Percent of Adoptions Finalized < 24 Months	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	509	114	22.40%	-72.3
Anderson	44	9	20.00%	-7.7

Explanation of Item 9: Adoption

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item evaluates the process within the child welfare system to achieve timely adoptions for children in foster care. During the state fiscal year 2008 Anderson DSS completed 33 adoptions, with 12% of those finalized within 24 months. Anderson County completed 44 adoptions during the period under review, with 20% of those adoptions finalized within 24 months. Although this is a significant improvement, it falls short of the 36.6% objective.

<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	1	50	1	50	8	0

Explanation of Item 10: Permanency Goal of APPLA

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness and effectiveness of services provided to children with the permanency plan of APPLA. Reviewers also rate whether the agency attempted to locate and reassess relatives or non-relatives that were willing to commit to the youth's long-term care every six months.

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

Reviewers found that in 50% of the cases reviewed, there is no documentation to support that the youth with the plan of APPLA was receiving the 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 six items:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 11) Proximity of foster care placement | Area Needing Improvement |
| 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

Performance Measure 13: Foster Children Placed Within county of Origin – Of all children in foster care during the reporting period (excluding MTS and Adoptions children), what percentage are placed within the county of origin?

Objective: >= 70% (Agency established objective)

	Number of Children in Foster Care	Number of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Percent of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	6,198	4,208	67.89%	(130.6)
Anderson	418	141	33.73%	(151.6)

Explanation of Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson 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 that at least 70% of the children in care be placed within the county. Agency data shows that 33.73% of Anderson DSS children were placed within the county. According to the agency data, the county has 68 foster homes to serve the existing 295 and new children entering care, which creates a reliance on short and long-term placements in neighboring counties.

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 12: Placement with Siblings						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	86	1	14	3	0

Explanation of Item 12: Placement with Siblings in Foster Care

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep siblings together when it is appropriate to do so. In 86% of the cases reviewed, siblings group were kept together when appropriate. One case was rated an area needing improvement, because there was no documented reason as to why a child was separated from their other two siblings.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	38	5	62	2	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to ensure that visits occur between children in foster care and their siblings and parents. In 62% of cases reviewed, visits between children in foster care and their parents were not occurring as required by policy. In those cases there was no explanation as to why the fathers were not included in visitation plans

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 14: Preserving Connections						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	89	1	11	1	0

Explanation of Item 14: Preserving Connections

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. Whereas, Item 13 addressed parents and siblings, this item evaluates the agency's efforts to preserve children's connections to the

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

people, places and things that are important to them. Reviewers found that in 89% of the cases reviewed, the agency did a good job of preserving the relationships that are important to children in foster care. Reviewers rated one case as an area needing improvement because the county failed to help the child maintain contact with relatives who were interested in being foster parents for the child.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 15: Relative Placement						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	20	8	80	0	0

Explanation of Item 15: Relative Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to identify and assess relatives as potential placement resources for children in foster care. In 80% of the foster care cases reviewed, maternal and paternal relatives were known to the agency, yet the agency failed to assess those relatives as placement options.

<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	6	100	4	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson 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. In every foster care case reviewed, reviewers found no evidence of the agency's efforts in supporting the parent-child relationships beyond the minimum required twice a month visitation. Agency policy encourages this; especially when infants and preschool aged children are involved.

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

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

The county'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 |

Onsite Review Findings

Well Being Item 17: Needs and Services of Child, Parents, Foster Parents

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	40	6	60	0	0
Treatment	4	40	6	60	0	0
Total Cases	8	40	12	60	0	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson 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 a weak area for both foster care and treatment cases. In 60% of the foster care cases and treatment cases reviewed, needs and services of the parents, caretakers and foster parents were not adequately assessed. Assessments generally focused on the mother, even when the children had been removed from her home. Those assessments generally ignored relative caregivers who were raising the children.

Onsite Review Findings

Well Being Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	10	9	90	0	0
Treatment	2	20	8	80	0	0
Total Cases	3	15	17	85	0	0

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. Reviewers found that in 90% of the foster care cases and 60% of the treatment cases reviewed, parents, caregivers and age-appropriate children were not involved in the case planning process. Parents were not actively engaged even if the agency had knowledge of their whereabouts. Some of the treatment plans were incomplete and not signed.

Agency Data				
Performance Measure 14: Face-to-Face Visits with Children (<18 years of age) Of all children in foster and treatment for at least one full calendar month during the reporting period, what percentage of children had a documented face-to-face visit every full calendar month during the reporting period?				
Objective: 100% (State Law)				
	Number of Children Under Agency Supervision at least One complete Calendar Month	Number of Children visited Every Month	Percent of Children Visited Every Month	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
Foster Care	390	313	80.26%	(77)
Treatment	1,214	851	70.10%	(77.4)

Explanation of Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with children under agency supervision, and evaluates the quality of those visits. State law and agency policy requires that children under agency supervision be seen each month. Agency data shows that 70.10% of the children in treatment and 80% of the children in foster care cases were visited monthly.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 20: Worker Visits with Parent(s)						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	14	6	86	3	0
Treatment	3	30	7	70	0	0
Total Cases	4	24	13	76	3	0

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

Explanation of Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with parents, and evaluates the quality of those visits. Eighty-six percent of the foster care cases and 70% of the treatment cases needed improvement because of the agency's failure to visit or attempt to contact both parents each month. Cases were rated as needing improvement when the agency failed to complete diligent searches for fathers to offer them the opportunity to parent or support their children.

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 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	6	75	2	25	2	0
Treatment	6	75	2	25	2	0
Total Cases	12	75	4	25	4	0

Explanation of Item 21: Educational Needs of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and address the educational needs of children under agency supervision. This was an area of strength for 75% of the foster care and treatment cases reviewed. However, the 25% of the cases that were rated an area needing improvement was because there was no evidence that the educational needs were assessed. There was also no school records in the case record or direct contact made with the school.

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**

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

Onsite Review Findings						
Well Being Item 22: Physical Health of the Child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	30	7	70	0	0
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	0
Total Cases	8	40	12	60	0	0

Explanation of Item 22: Physical Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the medical needs of children under agency supervision. Reviewers found that 70% of the foster care cases and 50% of the treatment cases needed improvement. In the foster care cases, the children did not receive their annual or bi-annual physical examinations as required by policy, or there was no follow up by the agency on identified medical problems. There were also no copies of dental or medical records in those cases. Several treatment cases needed improvement because workers failed to follow up with providers to determine if children's medical needs were being met.

Onsite Review Findings						
Well Being Item 23: Mental Health of the Child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	86	1	14	2	0
Treatment	6	75	2	25	2	0
Total Cases	13	81	3	19	4	0

Explanation of Item 23: Mental Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the mental health needs of children under agency supervision. In 81% of the cases, the children's mental health needs were assessed and met as needed. However, two treatment cases and one foster care case were rated as an area needing improvement because there was no evidence of the children's mental health needs being assessed.

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

Unfounded Investigations

<u>Review Findings</u>	Yes	No
Was the investigation initiated timely?	5	0
Was the assessment adequate?	3	2
Was the decision adequate?	3	2

Explanation of Item 24: Unfounded Investigations

This is an area of **Strength** for Anderson DSS. This item evaluates the agency’s investigative process and determines if decisions were supported by the facts of the cases. All five of the investigations reviewed were initiated timely. Two of the assessments were not adequate because the worker failed to interview key persons in the case. Consequently, the agency’s decision to unfound those cases was not supported by the available evidence.

Screened Out Intakes

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>	Yes	No	Cannot Determine
Was Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	7	3	0
Were necessary Collaterals Contacted?	3	2	Not Applicable 5
Were Appropriate Referrals made?	1	1	8

Explanation of Item 25: Screened Out Intakes

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item evaluates the process by which the agency screens out reports of abuse and/or neglect to determine if the intakes were appropriately screened out. Reviewers determined that seven out of the 10 reviewed intakes were screened out appropriately. However, there were three intakes screened out that should have been accepted for investigation. In each of those intakes, there were allegations of domestic violence between the parents and paramours in the presence of the children who were under the age of 10. The agency failed to make the necessary collateral contacts with Mental Health and Law Enforcement to obtain information that may have supported its decision.

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

Foster Home Licenses

Agency Data				
Performance Measure 4: Foster Homes/Facilities with Current Licenses				
Objective: >= 100% (Agency Policy)				
	Number of Open Homes & Facilities	Homes with Current License	Percent of Homes with Current License	Above or (Below) Standard
State	3,526	3,503	99.35	
Anderson	68	66	97.06%	(1.6)

Explanation of Item 26: Foster Home Licenses

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS this item evaluates the process by which the agency ensures that all foster homes comply with licensing requirements. Agency data shows that Anderson DSS allowed the licenses of two different homes to expire. Reviewers found three foster home licenses that were not valid because the homes did not meet the necessary requirements.

1. In two cases, renewal licenses were issued without the foster father having the required 28 training hours. SLED, CPS and Sexual Offenders check not completed on the foster parent's adult daughters who are used as babysitters at least twice a month.
2. Foster parent moved several times and there were no updated health inspections of those residences.

Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2009

ANDERSON 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: Str	Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	4/4=100%	0	16
Item 2: ANI	Repeat maltreatment	16/20=80%	4/20=20%	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	10/12=83%	2/12=17%	8
Item 4: ANI	Risk of harm to child(ren)	17/20=85%	3/20=15%	0
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.				
Item 5: *Str	Foster care re-entries	2/2=100%	0	8
Item 6: ANI	Stability of foster care placement	7/10=70%	3/10=30%	0
Item 7: ANI	Permanency goal for child	4/10=40%	6/10=60%	0
Item 8: ANI	Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	2/5=40%	3/5=60%	5
Item 9: ANI	Adoption	1/3=33%	2/3=67%	7
Item 10: ANI	Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	1 / 2=50%	1 / 2=50%	8
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.				
Item 11: *ANI	Proximity of foster care placement	9/9= 100%	0	1
Item 12: ANI	Placement with siblings	6/7=86%	1/7=14%	3
Item 13: ANI	Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	3/8=38%	5/8=62%	2
Item 14: ANI	Preserving connections	8/9=89%	1/9=11%	1
Item 15: ANI	Relative placement	2/10=20%	8/10=80%	0
Item 16: ANI	Relationship of child in care with parents	0	6/6=100%	4
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	8/20=40%	12/20=60%	0
Item 18: ANI	Child and family involvement in case planning	3/20=15%	17/20=85%	0
Item 19: ANI	Worker visits with child	11/20=55%	9/20=45%	0
Item 20: ANI	Worker visits with parent(s)	4/17=24%	13/17=76%	3
Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.				
Item 21: ANI	Educational needs of the child	12/16=75%	4/16=25%	4
Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.				
Item 22: ANI	Physical health of the child	8/20=40%	12/20=60%	0
Item 23: ANI	Mental health of the child	13/16=81%	3/16=19%	4

The objective is that 95% of cases be rated "Strength."

Str = Strength

ANI = Area Needing Improvement

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