

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

During the week of Sept 24-28, 2007 a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Greenville 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, Greenville DSS supervisors, 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.

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

Ratings

The standard that must be met for all items reviewed onsite is 90%. Each outcome report has its own standard. To be rated 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 **Area Needing Improvement**

Agency Data				
Measure S1.1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations on Reports of Child Maltreatment				
Data Time Period: September 1, 2006 to August 31, 2007				
Objective: 100% in <= 24 hours (state law)				
	Number of Determinations	Number of Investigations Initiated Timely	Percent of Investigations Initiated Timely	Number of Investigations Above (Below) Objective
State	17,893	17,590	98.3	(303)
Greenville	1,456	1,449	99.5	(7)

Explanation of Item 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Child Maltreatment

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all (100%) accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. The outcome report indicates that 99.5% of investigations were initiated within 24 hours. Although the agency failed to initiate only seven of 1,456 investigations within 24 hours, reviewers found other problems with how some investigations were initiated. In some instances, when parents were not home, several days passed before a second attempt to initiate contact was made.

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

Agency Data

Measure S1.2: Repeat 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 September 1, 2006 to August 31, 2007

Objective: <= 6.1% (federal standard)

	Number of Child Victims in Founded Report	Number of Child Victims In Another Founded Report	Percent of Children in Another Founded Report	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	11,062	89	0.80%	585.8
Greenville	1,012	22	0.17%	39.7

Onsite Review Findings

Safety Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	6	60	4	40	0	0
Total Cases	16	80	4	20	0	0

Explanation of Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville 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 suggests that only .17% of the children under Greenville DSS supervision experience repeat maltreatment. However, reviewers found that 40% of the children in in-home treatment cases experienced repeat or on-going maltreatment. Those incidents were not captured by agency data because they did not trigger new reports.

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

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 Child(ren) in Home and Prevent Removal.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	50	1	50	8	0
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	0
Total Cases	6	50	6	50	8	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item assesses whether services were adequate to protect children in their home and prevent their removal and placement into foster care. In half of the treatment cases reviewed, families received services needed to ensure the safety of the children who remained with their parents or relatives. In some cases parents were referred to counseling and other services even when the agency had evaluations stating that the parents did not have the intellectual ability to benefit from those services.

Onsite Review Findings

Safety Item 4: Risk of Harm

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0
Treatment	4	40	6	60	0	0
Total Cases	12	60	8	40	0	0

Explanation of Item 4: Risk of Harm

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item assesses whether the agency's interventions reduced risks of harm to children. In several cases staff documented their inability to obtain ex-parte removal orders or have law enforcement EPC children in in-home treatment cases when workers determined that those children were in imminent danger.

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

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 | Strength |
| 9) Adoption | Area Needing Improvement |
| 10) Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA) | Strength |

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 Sept 1, 2006 to Aug 13, 2007	Number That Were returned Home Within The Past 12 Months From Previous Foster Care Episode	Percent That Were returned Home Within The Past 12 Months From Previous Foster Care Episode	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,748	229	6.11%	93.3
Greenville	305	8	2.62	18.2

Explanation of Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries

This is area of **Strength** for Greenville 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. The percentage of children re-entering care in Greenville is 2.62%.

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

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 not more than 2 placement settings.				
Objective: \geq 86.7% (federal standard)				
	Number of Children In Care Less Than 12 Months	Number of Children With No More Than Two Placements Settings	Percent of Children With No More Than Two Placements Settings	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	4,325	3,476	80.37%	(273.8)
Greenville	336	259	77.08%	(32.3)

Explanation of Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville 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 only 77.08% of the children in Greenville DSS had two or fewer placements. Even though, the percentage of Greenville children in care over age 12 (28%) is lower than the county office average (32%). Not all of the agency's placement instability can be attributed to the older children in care.

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: \geq 53% (agency established objective)				
	Children in Care At Least 15 of Last 22 Months Sept 1, 2006 to Aug 31, 2007	Number of Children With TPR Complaint	Percent of Children With TPR Complaint	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,635	1,658	45.6%	(268.6)
Greenville	349	153	43.8%	(32.0)

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

Explanation of Item 7: Permanency Goal for Children

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville 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. Only 43.8% of the appropriate cases had TPR petitions filed. Reviewers found that 70% of the children's cases had appropriate permanency plans. Each of the cases rated Area Needing Improvement continued to have a plan of Return Home when the agency's history with the families made it clear that the children should not be returned to their parent's care.

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 latest removal from home?

Objective: ≥ 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
Greenville	165	147	89.1	21.3

Explanation of Item 8: Reunification or Permanent Placement with Relatives

This is an area of **Strength** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the activities and processes necessary to accomplish the goal of reunification with caregivers or placement with relatives. Agency data indicated that 89.1% of Greenville County children were reunified within 12 months of entering care. That level of performance exceeds the agency objective.

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

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: \geq 32% (federal standard)				
	Number of Children Whose Adoption Was Finalized During Sept 1, 2006 to Aug 31, 2007	Number of Children Whose Adoption Was Finalized in < 24 Months	Percent of Children Whose Adoption Was Finalized in < 24 Months	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	387	61	15.8%	(62.8)
Greenville	38	11	29.0%	(1.2)

Onsite Review Findings						
Permanency Item 9: Adoption						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	25	6	75	2	0

Explanation of Item 9: Adoption

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville 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. Only 29% of Greenville’s adoptions were completed within 24 months. Reviewers found various reasons for delays in permanency for children with this plan. Some children had been in pre-adoptive placements that disrupted. Some were older children with behavioral disorders that made finding adoptive families difficult.

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

Onsite Review Findings						
Permanency Item 10: Permanency Goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	100			9	

Explanation of Item 10: Permanency Goal of APPLA

This is an area of **Strength** for Greenville 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. Only 13.8% of the children in the care of Greenville DSS have this plan. 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.

This outcome is based on the rating of 6 items:

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

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 established objective)				
	Number of Children In Care 9/1/06 to 8/31/07	Number of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Percent of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	6,601	4,150	62.9	(470.7)
Greenville	595	322	54.1	(94.5)

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

Explanation of Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville 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 only 54% of Greenville DSS children were placed within the county. Although the agency is actively recruiting new foster homes, it has only 108 homes to serve the 395 children in care.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 12: Placement with Siblings						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	89	1	11	1	0

Explanation of Item 12: Placement with Siblings in Foster Care

This is an area of **Strength** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep siblings together when it is appropriate to do so. The agency generally did a very good job of placing siblings together. It was less able to keep siblings together when the children experienced a placement change.

<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 Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to ensure that visits occur between children in foster care and their siblings and parents. In the majority of cases (86%) visits occurred according to agency policy. However, the agency fell just short of its 90% objective because, in some cases, siblings placed in different parts of the state because of their therapeutic needs were not given the opportunity to see one another.

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

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

Explanation of Item 14: Preserving Connections

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville 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. Caseworkers clearly identified their client's significant relationships with former teachers, grandparents and other relatives yet failed to make any effort to help their clients maintain those relationships.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 15: Relative Placement						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	71	2	29	3	0

Explanation of Item 15: Relative Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to identify and assess relatives as potential placement resources for children in foster care. Only 29% of the cases reviewed were rated strength for this item. Although relatives were assessed in most (71%) cases, there were lapses. In those cases rated Area Needing Improvement, a single relative was assessed and all others were ignored.

<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	3	100	7	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville 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. Reviewers found no efforts by caseworkers to

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

involve parents in anything other than the minimum two visits per month. This was true even when dealing with pre-school aged children and children transitioning from foster care to home.

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 |

Onsite Review Findings

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

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	70	3	30	0	0
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	0
Total Cases	12	60	8	40	0	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville 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? Although more foster care cases were rated Strength for this item than treatment cases, both areas needed 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.

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	43	4	57	3	0
Treatment	3	30	7	70	0	0
Total Cases	6	35	11	65	3	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. Reviewers found that involving parents and age-appropriate children in case planning occurred in less than half of the cases.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 19: Worker Visits with Child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	0
Total Cases	13	65	7	35	0	0

Explanation of Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with children under agency supervision, and evaluates the quality of those visits. In 35% of the cases caseworkers failed to see the children one or more months. The weakest area was in-home treatment cases, with 50% rated needing improvement. When dealing with sibling groups caseworkers often saw some, but not all of the children monthly.

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	0	0	2	100	8	0
Treatment	3	30	7	70	0	0
Total Cases	3	25	9	75	8	0

Explanation of Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with parents, and evaluates the quality of those visits. Only 25% of the cases were rated Strength for this item. Caseworkers failed to see the parents of children one or more months during the one-year period under review. In some instances, case records contained no explanation for why the agency did not attempt to involve the fathers of children in care.

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

21) Educational need 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	5	71	2	29	3	0
Treatment	5	63	3	37	2	0
Total Cases	10	67	5	33	5	0

Explanation of Item 21: Educational Needs of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville 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 just over half of the cases (67%), which does not meet the agency objective of 90%. Both foster care and in-home treatment cases showed deficiencies in this area. Some cases contained school records indicating that the child was having academic or behavior problems, but contained no evidence that the caseworker attempted to communicate with the school to address those problems. Those lapses were not evident in cases managed by the adoptions office.

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

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

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	6	60	4	40	0	0
Total Cases	9	45	11	55	0	0

Explanation of Item 22: Physical Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and attend to the physical and dental health needs of children under agency supervision. Over half of the cases reviewed (55%) were rated an area needing improvement for this item. Both foster care and in-home treatment cases showed deficiencies in this area. In some instances the problem was a failure to assess the need. In other cases, there was no evidence that caseworkers followed up to determine if identified medical needs of children were being addressed.

Onsite Review Findings

Well Being Item 23: Mental Health of the Child

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	50	5	50	0	0
Treatment	5	71	2	29	3	0
Total Cases	10	63	7	37	3	0

Explanation of Item 23: Mental Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the mental health needs of children under agency supervision. Only 63% of the cases reviewed were rated strength for this item. Both foster care and in-home treatment cases showed deficiencies in this area. In some instances there was a failure to assess the mental health needs of the children. However, some of the children had identified behavioral and mental health problems, yet were not receiving services to address those problems.

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

Unfounded Investigations

	Yes	No
Investigation initiated timely?	3	2
Was assessment adequate?	1	4
Was decision appropriate?	1	4

Explanation of Item 24: Unfounded Investigations

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the effectiveness of the agency's investigative process and determines if its decisions were supported by the facts in the cases. The decision to unfound four of the five cases reviewed was not supported by the information in the assessments. Investigations failed to include interviews with all relevant parties. For example, a victim child would be interviewed, but not other children in the home or the day care provider. Law enforcement might be contacted, but not the school or medical care provider.

Screened Out Intakes

	Yes	No	Cannot Determine
Was Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	5	1	4
	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?	1	6	3
Were Appropriate Referrals Made?	1		9

Explanation of Item 25: Screened Out Intakes

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville 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. The county frequently is not using intake dictation to clearly support its decision to screen out reports of abuse and neglect. This resulted in a rating of **Cannot Determine** for four of the 10 intakes reviewed. One case was inappropriately screened out because the worker used the wrong name in the CAPSS search and found nothing. However, there was a history, which, along with the current allegation, should have caused the agency to investigate.

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

Foster Home Licensing

Explanation of Item 26: Foster Home Licenses

This is an area of **Strength** for Greenville DSS.

1. Quarterly visits are consistently done and all relevant issues are addressed during those visits.
2. There are no expired licenses.
3. Foster parent training hours are up-to-date.
4. CAPSS documentation is consistent with documentation in the paper file.
5. Some records show that foster children are occasionally cared for by family members who have not been assessed by the agency.

Greenville County DSS
Review of Child Welfare Services
September 2007

Greenville 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:	ANI	Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	4/8 = 50%	4/8 = 50%	12
Item 2:	ANI	Repeat maltreatment	16/20 = 80%	4/20 = 20%	
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	6/12 = 50%	6/12 = 50%	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	2/2 = 100%		8
Item 6:	ANI*	Stability of foster care placement	9/10 = 90%	1/10 = 10%	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		1/1 = 100%	9
Item 9:	ANI	Adoption	2/8 = 25%	6/8 = 75%	2
Item 10:	Str	Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	1/1 = 100%		9
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.					
Item 11:	ANI*	Proximity of foster care placement	7/7 = 100%		3
Item 12:	Str	Placement with siblings	8/9 = 89%	1/9 = 11%	1
Item 13:	ANI	Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	3/8 = 38%	5/8 = 62%	2
Item 14:	ANI	Preserving connections	1/7 = 14%	6/7 = 86%	3
Item 15:	ANI	Relative placement	5/7 = 71%	2/7 = 29%	3
Item 16:	ANI	Relationship of child in care with parents		3/3 = 100	7
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	12/20 = 60%	8/20 = 40%	0
Item 18:	ANI	Child and family involvement in case planning	6/17 = 35%	11/17 = 65%	3
Item 19:	ANI	Worker visits with child	13/20 = 65%	7/20 = 35%	0
Item 20:	ANI	Worker visits with parent(s)	3/12 = 25%	9/12 = 75%	8
Item 21:	ANI	Educational needs of the child	10/15 = 67%	5/15 = 33%	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	9/20 = 45%	11/20 = 55%	0
Item 23:	ANI	Mental health of the child	10/16 = 63%	6/16 = 37%	4

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