

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

During the week of July 31 to Aug 4, 2006 a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an on-site review of child welfare services in McCormick 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, McCormick DSS supervisors, and representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem.

**Period included in Case Record Review: January 1, 2006 to June 30, 2006**

**Period included in Outcome Measures: July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006**

**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 (sec 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.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

**Section One**

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

**Summary of Findings**

**Overall Finding: Partially Achieved**

-Safety Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations. **Finding: Strength**

-Safety Item 2: Repeat maltreatment.

**Finding: Area Needing Improvement**

Analysis of Safety Item 1 Findings

**Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

**Measure S1.1: Timeliness of initiating investigations** on reports of child maltreatment

Data Time Period: 07/1/05 to 06/30/06

	Number of Reports Accepted	Number of Investigations Initiated Timely	Number of Investigations Objective $\geq 99.99\%^*$	Number of Investigations Above (Below) Objective
State	16,250	15,648	16,248.38	-600.38
McCormick	8	8	8.00	0.00

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

**Site Visit Findings** Performance Item Ratings

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

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	100	0	0	5	0
Treatment	1	100	0	0	6	0
Total Cases	3	100	0	0	11	0

**Explanation of Item 1**

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. CAPSS data indicates that all 8 of the reports investigated during the period under review were initiated timely (within 24 hours). Onsite reviewers further determined that high and medium risk cases were investigated within 2 hours and 12 hours respectively, as required by agency policy.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

Analysis of Safety Item 2 Findings

**Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

**Measure S1.2: Recurrence of Maltreatment** – Of all children who were victims of indicated reports of child abuse and/or neglect during the reporting period, the percent having another indicated report within a subsequent 6 month period.

Indicated Reports Between Nov 1, 2004 and Dec 31, 2005

	Number of Child Victims	Number of Child Victims In Another Founded Rept	Number of Children Objective <= 93.90%	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	10,323	70	9693.30	559.70
McCormick	11	0	10.33	0.67

Note: This is a federally established objective.

**Site Visit Findings** Performance Item Ratings

**Safety Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment.**

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	71	2	29	0	0
Treatment	7	100	0	0	0	0
Total Cases	12	86	2	14	0	0

**Explanation of Item 2**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. CAPSS data suggests that there were no incidents of repeat maltreatment during the period under review. Onsite reviewers found that 2 of the 7 children in foster care were removed from their homes by the police via Emergency Protective Custody (EPC) while Saluda DSS had open in-home treatment cases on the family of those children.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

Section Two

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

<b><u>Summary of Findings</u></b>	<b>Overall Finding: Not Achieved</b>
-Safety Item 3: Services to prevent removal.	<b>Finding: Area Needing Improvement</b>
-Safety Item 4: Risk of harm to child (ren).	<b>Finding: Area Needing Improvement</b>

Analysis of Safety Item 3 Findings

<b><u>Site Visit Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Safety Item 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal.</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	0	0	2	100	5	0
Treatment	3	60	2	40	2	0
<b>Total Cases</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>

**Explanation of Item 3**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. In 2 of the 7 treatment cases reviewed there was no risk of harm to the children. The cases remained open so that the agency could provide services to the families. One of the treatment cases was rated Area Needing Improvement because the family was receiving none of the services needed to protect the children in the home, even though those services were identified in the treatment plan. The other treatment case received this rating because the worker focused on the victim child while ignoring the other child in the family who had been the victim child in a previous case. Services to the families of several children in foster care were appropriate.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

Analysis of Safety Item 4 Findings

<b><u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u></b>				
Measure S2.2: <b>Risk of harm to child</b> – Of all unfounded investigations during the reporting period, the percent receiving subsequent reports within six months of the initial report.				
	Number Alleged Child Victims in an Unfounded Report 01/01/05 to 12/31/06	Number With Another Report Within 6 Months of Unfounded Determination	Number of Cases Met Objective $\geq 91.50\%$ *	Number of Cases Above (Below) Objective
State	14,508	1,067	13,274.82	166.18
McCormick	4	0	3.66	0.34

This is a DSS established objective.

<b><u>Site Visit Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Safety Item 4: Risk of harm.</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	1	20	4	80	2	0
Total Cases	8	67	4	33	2	0

**Explanation of Item 4**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. Reviewers found no discernable risk of harm to any of the children in foster care. They were safe in their foster care placements and none were at risk of returning home to dangerous situations. However, children in 4 of the 5 applicable in-home treatment cases remained at risk of harm. As mentioned in Item 3, some children remained at risk because the families never received needed protective services. The children in one family remained at risk because the mother was so severely mentally ill that she could not benefit from the services prescribed in the treatment plan.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

**Section Three**

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

**Summary of Findings**

<b>Overall Finding:</b>	<b>Partially Achieved</b>
-Item 5: Foster care re-entries	<b>Finding: Strength</b>
-Item 6: Stability of foster care placement	<b>Finding: Strength</b>
-Item 7: Permanency goal for child	<b>Finding: Area Needing Improvement</b>
-Item 8: Reunification, placement with relatives	<b>Findings: Area Needing Improvement</b>
-Item 9: Adoption	<b>Findings: Area Needing Improvement</b>
-Item 10: Perm goal of other planned arrangement	<b>Findings: Strength</b>

Analysis of Safety Permanency Item 5 Findings

**Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

Measure P3.1: **Foster Care Re-entries** – Of all children who entered care during the year under review, the percent that re-entered foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode.

	Number Children Entering Care 07/01/05 to 06/30/06	Number That Were Returned Home Within The Past 12 Months From Previous Foster Care Episode	Number of Children Objective $\geq 91.40\%$ *	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,312	248	3,027.17	36.83
McCormick	2	0	1.83	0.17

\* This is a federally established objective.

**Site Visit Findings** Performance Item Ratings

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

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	100	0	0	5	0

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

**Explanation of Item 5**

**Foster Care Re-entries is a Strength for McCormick DSS.** This item determines if children are re-entering foster care within a year of returning home. Both the CAPSS report and the onsite review findings indicate that is not happening in McCormick.

**Analysis of Safety Permanency Item 6 Findings**

**Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

Measure P3.2: **Stability of Foster Care Placement** – Of all children who have been in foster care less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home, the percent that had not more than 2 placement settings.

	Number of Children In Care Less Than 12 Months	Number of Children With No More Than 2 Placements	Number of Children Objective $\geq 86.70\%*$	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,799	3,046	3,293.73	-247.73
McCormick	2	2	1.73	0.27

Note: This is a federally established objective.

**Site Visit Findings** Performance Item Ratings

**Permanency Item 6:** Stability of foster care placement.

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

**Explanation of Item 6**

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. Both the outcome report from CAPSS and onsite review findings indicate that placements for McCormick County foster children are stable.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

Analysis of Safety Permanency Item 7 Findings

<b><u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u></b>				
Measure P3.5: <b>Permanency Goal for Child</b> – Of all children who have been in foster care for 15 of the most recent 22 months, the percent for which a Termination of Parental Rights (TPR) petition has been filed.				
	Children in Care At Least 15 of Last 22 Months 07/2005 – 06/2006	Number Children With TPR Complaint	Number of Children Objective >= 53.00%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,611	1,662	1,913.83	-251.83
McCormick	9	5	4.77	0.23

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

<b><u>Site Visit Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 7:</b> Permanency goal for children.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	71	2	29	0	0

**Explanation of Item 7**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. To meet the criteria established in the CAPSS report 53.00% or more of the children in care 15 of the most recent 22 months must have a TPR petition filed. McCormick DSS met that standard with a percentage of 56 (5/9). However, onsite reviewers found that the agency took too long deciding on and sticking to the plan of adoption for two children in foster care. One child had a plan of Return Home for 3½ years before that plan was changed to TPR/Adoption. Another child had his plan changed from Adoption to placement with a relative twice. After several years in foster care he has not been placed with a relative or adopted. The agency is currently exploring another relative placement. The other 5 children appear to have appropriate permanency plans.



**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

Analysis of Safety Permanency Item 8 Findings

<b><u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u></b>				
Measure P3.3: <b>Length of Time to Achieve Reunification</b> – Of all children who were reunified with their parents or caregiver, at the time of discharge from foster care, the percent reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home.				
	Number of Children Where Fos Care Services Closed. Last Plan Was Return Home 07/01/05– 06/30/06	Number of Children In Care Less Than 12 Months	Number Of Children Objective >= 76.20%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	2,344	1,949	1,786.13	163.87
McCormick	0	0	0	0

\* This is a federally established objective.

<b><u>Site Visit Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 8:</b> Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	67	1	33	4	0

**Explanation of Item 8**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. McCormick DSS returned no children home in the prior 12 months. Onsite reviewers assessed the cases of the 3 children in foster care with a plan of Return Home. For two of those children the plan of Return Home was appropriate. Reviewers rated this item an Area Needing Improvement for a third child. This child had been in foster care 22 months with a plan of TPR/Adoption. The plan was recently changed to placement with a relative. However, the relative under consideration had a recent conviction for a violent felony.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

Analysis of Permanency Item 9 Findings

<b><u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u></b>				
Measure P3.4: <b>Length of Time to Achieve Adoption</b> – Of all children who exited from foster care during the year under review to a finalized adoption, the percent that exited care in less than 24 months from the time of the latest removal from home.				
	Number of Children With Finalized Adoption Within Past 12 Months	Number of Children Where Adoption Was Finalized Within 24 Months of Entering Care	Number of Children Objective $\geq 32.00\%$ *	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	410	55	131.20	-76.20
McCormick	0	0	0	0

Note: This is a federally established objective.

<b><u>Site Visit Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 9:</b> Adoption.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	0	0	3	100	4	0

**Explanation of Item 9**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. The outcome report shows that no adoptions were completed in the past 12 months. This item was rated Area Needing Improvement for all 3 of the children in care with a plan of adoption. The reasons for this rating were explained in Items 7 and 8 above.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

Analysis of Permanency Item 10 Findings

**Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

Measure P3.6: **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.

	Number of Children In Care at Least One Day 07/01/05 – 06/30/06	Number of Children In Care With Perm Plan “Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement”	Number of Children Objective >= 85.00%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	8,242	1,470	7,005.70	-233.70
McCormick	6	2	5.10	-1.10

\* This is a DSS established objective.

**Site Visit Findings** Performance Item Ratings

**Permanency Item 10:** Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	100	0	0	6	0

**Explanation of Item 10**

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. The standard for this objective is that no more than 15% of the children in foster care should have this plan (APPLA – Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement). This outcome measures the percentage of children with this plan. Onsite reviewers found that one of the seven children in care had a plan of APPLA. The plan was appropriate for that child and that child was receiving necessary independent living services.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

**Section Four**

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

**Summary of Findings**

<b>Overall Finding:</b>	<b>Partially Achieved</b>
-Item 11: Proximity of placement	<b>Finding: Area Needing Improvement</b>
-Item 12: Placement with siblings.	<b>Finding: Strength</b>
-Item 13: Visiting with parents & siblings	<b>Finding: Area Needing Improvement</b>
-Item 14: Preserving connections	<b>Findings: Strength</b>
-Item 15: Relative placement	<b>Findings: Strength</b>
-Item 16: Relationship of child with parents	<b>Findings: Strength</b>

Analysis of Permanency Item 11 Findings

**Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

Measure P4.1: **Proximity of Foster Care Placement** – Of all children in foster care during the reporting period (excluding MTS and Adoptions children), the percent placed within their county of origin.

	Number of Children In Care 07/01/05 – 06/30/06	Number of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Percent of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Number of Children Objective >= 70.00%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	6,154	3,909	63.52	4,307.80	-398.80
McCormick	6	1	16.67	4.20	-3.20

\* This is a DSS established objective.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

<b>Site Visit Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement.</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	100	0	0	3	0

**Explanation of Item 11**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. To meet this objective 70%, or more, of the children in care must be placed in McCormick County. The outcome report indicates that 17% (1/6) of the children in care were placed in the county. Most of McCormick's children were placed in neighboring Greenwood, Abbeville and Edgefield counties. This cluster of counties with small populations shares social service providers and has a history of sharing foster homes. This practice has rendered McCormick DSS dependent on foster care placements outside of the county.

<b>Site Visit Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 12: Placement with siblings</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	100	0	0	2	0

**Explanation of Item 12**

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. It was apparent that the agency attempted to place siblings together when resources and circumstances made that possible. The need to keep siblings together is one of the reasons some children were placed out of county in Connie Maxwell Children's Home in Greenwood County.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

<b>Site Visit Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 13:</b> Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	75	1	25	3	0

**Explanation of Item 13**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. In most (75%) instances the agency did a good job of arranging for visits between children in foster care and their parents and with siblings placed in another setting. The one case rated Area Needing Improvement involved a sibling group of two – in which one of the children was managed by MTS and the other by the county. Coordination between the two offices on visits was poor to non-existent.

<b>Site Visit Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 14:</b> Preserving connections						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	100	0	0	6	0

**Explanation**

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. This item addresses the agency's ability to preserve a child in foster care's connection to the people, places and things that are important to him. The level of dysfunction in the families of most of the children meant that it was not in their best interest to preserve connection to those family members. In the one applicable case reviewed relationships were appropriately supported by the agency.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

<b>Site Visit Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 15: Relative placement</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	100	0	0	1	0

**Explanation of Item 15**

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. This item addresses the agency's effectiveness in identifying and assessing the relatives of children in foster care as possible caregivers. In every applicable case reviewed there was evidence that both maternal and paternal relatives were assessed as placement options for the children in foster care.

<b>Site Visit Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Permanency Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	100	0	0	4	0

**Explanation of Item 16**

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. This item addresses the agency's effectiveness in promoting or maintaining a strong emotionally supportive relationship between children in care and their parents. Every applicable case reviewed showed parental involvement based on the needs of the child rather than merely meeting the minimum visitation requirement.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

**Section Five**

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

**Summary of Findings**

**Overall Finding:**

- Item 17: Needs & services
- Item 18: Involvement in case planning
- Item 19: Worker visits with child
- Item 20: Worker visits with parent(s)

**Not Achieved**

- Finding: Area Needing Improvement**
- Finding: Area Needing Improvement**
- Finding: Area Needing Improvement**
- Findings: Area Needing Improvement**

**Site Visit Findings** Performance Item Ratings

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

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	2	33	4	67	1	0
Total Cases	9	69	4	31	1	0

**Explanation of Item 17**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick 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? All foster care cases were rated "Strength" because assessments were good and the needs of parents were addressed by agency interventions. In one treatment case there was little evidence of an assessment, and there was no treatment plan. In the other 3 treatment cases rated Area Needing Improvement there was a treatment plan, but no evidence that anything on the plan was being done or that the worker was addressing identified issues.



**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

<b>Site Visit Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Well Being Item 18:</b> Child and family involvement in case planning						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	100	0	0	4	0
Treatment	2	29	5	71	0	0
Total Cases	5	50	5	50	4	0

**Explanation of Item 18**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. Only 41% of the cases reviewed showed evidence that the worker involved the parent(s) in the development of their case plan. Several cases had no case plan. Parents in treatment cases were usually not involved in case planning. Plans were either not written at all or were written by the caseworker and the parent was told what they had to do. Most case plans were not signed by parents.

<b>Site Visit Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Well Being Item 19:</b> Worker visits with child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	5	71	2	29	0	0
Total Cases	12	86	2	14	0	0

**Explanation of Item 19**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. This rating is based on two questions: 1) Were McCormick DSS staff visiting children according to policy, and 2) did the visits focus on issues related to the treatment plan? Both the onsite review and outcome report show that face-to-face contact with children in foster care was occurring according to policy. Two in-home treatment cases were rated Area Needing Improvement because the children in those cases were not seen monthly.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

<b>Site Visit Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Well Being Item 20:</b> Worker visits with parent(s)						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	100	0	0	4	0
Treatment	3	43	4	57	0	0
Total Cases	6	60	4	40	4	0

**Explanation of Item 20**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. In all applicable foster care cases visits with parents were done according to policy. Children in treatment cases were often being cared for by someone other than their parents, usually grandparents. Worker contacts tended to focus on a single caregiver and no one else. If the children were with the grandparents, then the grandparents were seen each month, but not the parents, to whom the children would likely return. In treatment cases, fathers were often ignored.

**Section Six**

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

**Summary of Findings**

**Overall Finding:** **Substantially Achieved**

<b>Site Visit Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Well Being Item 21:</b> Educational needs of child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	100	0	0	2	0
Treatment	4	80	1	20	2	0
Total Cases	9	90	1	10	4	0

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

**Explanation of Item 21**

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. This item asks two questions: 1) did DSS assess the educational needs of the children under their supervision, and 2) were identified educational needs addressed? The answer to both questions was “Yes” for the 10 applicable cases reviewed. School records were in the files. Educational performance was assessed during monthly visits.

**Section Seven**

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

**Summary of Findings**

**Overall Finding:**

- Item 22: Physical health of the child
- Item 23: Mental health of the child

**Partially Achieved**

**Finding: Area Needing Improvement**

**Finding: Strength**

**Site Visit Findings** Performance Item Ratings

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

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	4	67	2	33	1	0
Total Cases	11	85	2	15	1	0

**Explanation of Item 22**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. Case records clearly documented that children in foster care were receiving regular physical examinations, and that identified medical needs were receiving proper attention. The medical need of most, but not all children in treatment cases were being properly met. One treatment case was rated Area Needing Improvement because the medical needs of only one of the two children in the home was assessed. The other case received this rating because the agency failed to follow up with medical providers on an infant born to a drug abusing mother.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

<b>Site Visit Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings						
<b>Well Being Item 23:</b> Mental health of the child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	100	0	0	2	0
Treatment	3	75	1	25	3	0
Total Cases	8	89	1	11	5	0

**Explanation of Item 23**

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. In all but one case the agency did a good job of assessing the mental health needs of the children within their care. The agency and service providers caring for the children provided mental health services when it was warranted.

**Section Eight – Foster Home Licenses**

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. At the time of the onsite review McCormick DSS had 2 foster homes and 7 children in foster care.

Strengths:

1. Quarterly visits conducted timely and properly documented.
2. Checklist for quarterly visits used and all appropriate areas addressed.
3. Training hours completed prior to re-licensure and documented in CAPSS.

Area Needing Improvement:

1. No assessment of foster parent's live-in paramour.

**McCormick County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
July 2006**

**Section Nine – Unfounded Investigations**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Investigation initiated timely?	1	1
Was assessment adequate?	2	
Was decision appropriate?	2	

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. Assessments were thorough. All appropriate collateral contacts were made. The decisions to unfound the cases were correct, based on the available information. One case was rated a Medium risk but should have been rated High based on the allegation of sexual abuse.

---

**Section Ten – Screened Out Intakes**

Agency management felt the need to demonstrate to the community that DSS would respond to their reports. Consequently, McCormick DSS did not screen out any intakes during the period under review.

## McCormick County DSS

### McCormick County DSS Case Rating Summary

	Perf. Item Ratings			Outcome Ratings			
	Strength	Area Needing Improvement	N/A*	Substantially Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved	N/A
Outcome S1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.				12/14 = 86%	2/14 = 14%		
Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	3/3 = 100%	0	11				
Item 2: Repeat maltreatment	12/14 = 86%	2/14 = 14%					
Outcome S2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.				6/12 = 50%	4/12 = 33%	2/12 = 17%	2
Item 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	3/7 = 43%	4/7 = 57%	7				
Item 4: Risk of harm to child(ren)	8/12 = 67%	4/12 = 33%	2				
Outcome P1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.				3/7 = 43%	4/7 = 57%		
Item 5: Foster care re-entries	2/2 = 100%		5				
Item 6: Stability of foster care placement	7/7 = 100%						
Item 7: Permanency goal for child	5/7 = 71%	2/7 = 29%					
Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	2/3 = 67%	1/3 = 33%	4				
Item 9: Adoption		3/3 = 100%	4				
Item 10: Permanency goal of Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	1/1 = 100%		6				
Outcome P2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.				7/7 = 100%			
Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement	4/4 = 100%		3				
Item 12: Placement with siblings	5/5 = 100%		2				
Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	3/4 = 75%	1/4 = 25%	3				
Item 14: Preserving connections	1/1 = 100%		6				
Item 15: Asmt of relatives as placement options	6/6 = 100%		1				
Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents	3/3 = 100%		4				
Outcome WB1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.				10/14 = 71%	2/14 = 14.5%	2/14 = 14.5%	
Item 17: Needs & services of child, parents, & caregivers	9/13 = 69%	4/13 = 31%	1				
Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning	5/10 = 50%	5/10 = 50%	4				
Item 19: Worker visits with child(ren)	12/14 = 86%	2/14 = 14					
Item 20: Worker visits with parents	6/10 = 60%	4/10 = 40%	4				
Outcome WB2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.				9/10 = 90%	1/10 = 10%		4
Item 21: Educational needs of the child(ren)	9/10 = 90%	1/10 = 10%	4				
Outcome WB3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.				11/13 = 92%	2/13 = 8		1
Item 22: Physical health of the child	11/13 = 85%	2/13 = 15%	1				
Item 23: Mental health of the child	8/9 = 89%	1/9 = 11%	5				