

Anderson County DSS Child Welfare Services Review January 2007

During the week of January 8-12, 2007 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, Anderson DSS supervisors, and representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

Period included in Case Record Review: July 1, 2006 to December 31, 2006

Period included in Outcome Measures: September 1, 2005 to October 31, 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 (§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
January 2007**

Ratings

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

Section One

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

<u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u>				
Measure S1.1: Timeliness of initiating investigations on reports of child maltreatment				
Data Time Period: 09/1/05 to 08/31/06				
	Number of Reports Accepted	Number of Investigations Initiated Timely	Number of Investigations Objective 100%*	Number of Investigations Above (Below) Objective
State	16,328	15,784	16,328	(544)
Anderson	767	752	767	15

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

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Safety Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	100	0	0	7	0
Treatment	5	100	0	0	5	0
Total Cases	8	100	0	0	12	0

Explanation of Item 1

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. The October outcome report indicates that for the 12 month period under review Anderson County initiated 98% of the investigations of alleged abuse and neglect within 24-hours. The objective for this item is 100%. Based on CAPSS the county missed the established objective by a very

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

narrow percentage. The onsite review shows that all of the applicable cases met the objective. The rating of needing improvement was based on data from the outcome report that accounts for all of the cases during a 12 month period (whereas the onsite review focused on a sample).

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 six month period.

Indicated Reports Between November 1, 2005 to October 31, 2006

	Number of Child Victims	Number of Child Victims In Another Founded Rept	Number of Children Objective $\leq 90\%$	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	10,111	68	9099.9	548
Anderson	521	6	468.9	25.8

Note: This is a federally established objective.

Onsite Review Findings

Safety Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	83	1	17	4	0
Treatment	7	78	2	22	1	0
Total Cases	12	80	3	20	5	0

Explanation of Item 2

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson County. The outcome report counts cases with additional indicated reports within the period under review. Onsite reviewers use information documented in the case file to determine if the children under agency care are experiencing additional abuse or neglect, whether that additional abuse results in another indicated report or not. Reviewers found that despite the interventions of Anderson County several children experienced subsequent maltreatment. In one case, the reviewer noted no improvement in the parent's functioning despite repeated efforts by the agency to help the family.

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

Section Two

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

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
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	10	100	0	0	0	0
Total Cases	11	92	1	8	8	0

Explanation of Item 3

This is area of **Strength** for Anderson DSS. Most of the foster care cases were rated not applicable because the children entered care prior to the period under the review. However, the decision to remove those children from their homes and place them in foster care was consistently correct. The onsite review and CAPSS confirmed that the agency offered appropriate services to the family to protect children in the home.

<u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u>				
Measure S2.2: Risk of harm to child – 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 Rept 11/1/05 to 10/31/06	Number With Another Rept Within 6 Months of Unfounded Determination	Number of Cases Met Objective >= 91.50%*	Number of Cases Above (Below) Objective
State	14,753	1,108	13,498.99	13.7
Anderson	724	59	662.46	2.5

*This is a DSS established objective.

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Safety Item 4: Risk of harm.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	77	2	23	1	0
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0	0
Total Cases	14	74	5	26	1	0

Explanation of Item 4

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. Onsite reviewers found that the risk of harm to children in 74% of the cases was reduced as a result of DSS intervention. Risk of harm was not reduced in the other cases either because the parents were not cooperating or the services did not target critical needs. Thirty percent of the treatment cases were rated, area needing improvement because the agency's interventions were not reducing the risk of harm to the children in those families. In two cases, children were placed with alternative caregivers and children were still at risk of harm. One caregiver did not respect a court order restricting contact by the biological mother who tested positive for drugs. In another case, a youth revealed that his siblings were continuing to be abusive to him.

Stakeholder Comment: The stakeholders' comments regarding the agency's ability to reduce risk of harm were generally unfavorable and confirmed the onsite findings. Contributing factors for weaknesses in this and other areas can be partially attributed to worker turnover.

Management staff indicated that the average worker turnover rate was between 20 to 25% during the past year. Supervisors were forced to assume caseloads until new workers were hired and trained. Even the County Director made monthly foster care home visits.

Section Three

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

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

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 11/01/05 to 10/31/06	Number That Were Returned Home Within The Past 12 Months From Previous Fos Care Episode	Number of Children Objective >= 91.40%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,427	281	3,110.34	13.7
Anderson	204	14	186.45	3.5

*This is a federally established objective.

Explanation of Item 5

This is an area of **Strength** for Anderson DSS. Based on the outcome report (all of the cases reviewed onsite were rated not applicable) children re-entering foster care within a year of discharge is a relatively rare occurrence in Anderson County.

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 >= 86.70%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,936	3,185	3,412.51	227.5
Anderson	210	176	28	-6

Note: This is a federally established objective.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings

Permanency Item 6: Stability of foster care placement.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

Explanation of Item 6

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. Item 6, the federal standard for stability measured by the outcome report applies only to children in care less than 12 months. However, onsite reviewers assessed the stability of children regardless of their length of time in care. Reviewers determined that eight out of ten children in care had stable placements. According to the CAPSS outcome report and the onsite review findings, stability of foster care placement is an area needing improvement. This instability is due in large part to an insufficient number of foster homes. There are 59 foster homes for 267 foster children.

Stakeholder Comment: The majority of stakeholders indicated that there were not enough foster homes for the number of children in Anderson County. Contributing factors for a decrease in the number of foster homes may be attributed to worker turnover (foster parent licensing position) and the lack of ongoing recruitment efforts for additional foster parents.

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure P3.5: 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.

	Children in Care At Least 15 of Last 22 Months 011/1/2005 – 10/31/2006	Number Children With TPR Complaint	Number of Children Objective >= 53.00%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,563	1,672	1888.39	279
Anderson	247	118	130.91	12.9

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

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings

Permanency Item 7: Permanency goal for children.

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

Explanation of Item 7

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. To meet the criteria established in the CAPSS report 53% or more of the children in care 15 of the most recent 22 months must have a TPR petition filed. The agency met that standard. However, in four of ten cases reviewed onsite, the permanent goal for children was rated an area needing improvement. In

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

three of those cases the agency took too long to change the plan from return home to TPR/Adoption. In one case, reviewers found that several continuances delayed the permanent plan for the child.

Stakeholder Comment: Stakeholders indicated that there appeared to be inadequate legal support based on the number of court continuances and other court related delays.

<u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u>				
Measure P3.3: Length of Time to Achieve Reunification – 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 Foster Care Services Closed. Last Plan Was Return Home 11/01/05– 10/31/06	Number of Children In Care Less Than 12 Months	Number Of Children Objective >= 76.20%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	2,148	1,747	1,636.77	110.2
Anderson	100	51	76.2	-25.2

*This is a federally established objective.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	25	3	75	6	0

Explanation of Item 8

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. To meet this federally established criteria at least 76.20% of the children returned to their parents from foster care must be returned within 12 months of their removal from home. The outcome report shows that only 51% of the children were returned home within 12 months of entering care. Onsite reviewers found three cases in which court related delays adversely affected timeliness of this item.

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure P3.4: 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.

	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	413	67	132.16	65.2
Anderson	45	8	14.4	6.4

Note: This is a federally established objective.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings

Permanency Item 9: Adoption.

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

Explanation of Item 9

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. Anderson County leads the state in the number of finalized adoptions. However, this item was rated an area needing improvement because outcome data and the onsite indicated the foster children stayed in foster care too long before the adoptions were finalized. There were delays in filing petitions, continued hearings, and waiting too long before changing the plan from Return Home to TPR/Adoption.

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure P3.6: Permanency Goal of “Other Planned 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 11/01/05 – 10/31/06	Number of Children In Care With Perm Plan “Other Planned Living Arrangement”	Number of Children Objective >= 85.00%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	8,453	1,476	7,185	-208
Anderson	406	37	345.1	23.9

*This is a DSS established objective.

Onsite Review 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	9	0

Explanation of Item 10

This is an area of **Strength** for Anderson DSS. The standard for this objective is that no more than 15% of the children in foster care should have the plan, Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA). Only nine percent of the children in Anderson have this plan. The child in the sample case with the plan of APPLA was receiving appropriate independent living services to meet his needs.

Section Four

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

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

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 11/01/05 – 10/31/06	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	6,329	3,889	61.5	4,403.3	-541.3
Anderson	408	54	37.8	285.6	-131.6

*This is a DSS established objective.

Explanation of Item 11

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. Anderson County foster children are not placed in Anderson County because there are not enough foster homes for the number of children in care. The outcome report shows that 37.8% of children are placed within the county. However, the majority of the children are placed in adjacent counties.

Stakeholder Comment: There are not enough foster homes. They are not sure the agency is diligently recruiting. The needs of foster parents are met with “just prayer.” There is a huge need for foster homes and kids move too much.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings

Permanency Item 12: Placement with siblings

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	100	0	0	6	0

Explanation of Item 12

This is an area of **Strength** for Anderson DSS. All of the sibling groups that should have been placed together were placed together. There was one set of siblings that were not placed together because they were a threat to one another.

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	83	1	17	4	0

Explanation of Item 13

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. In most (83%) instances the agency did an excellent job of arranging for visits between children in foster care and their parents and with siblings placed in another setting. However, when one sibling is managed by MTS and the other siblings are managed by the county, improvements were needed in coordinating visitation.

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 14: Preserving connections						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	100	0	0	5	0

Explanation of Item 14

This is an area of **Strength** for Anderson DSS. This item addresses the agency's ability to preserve a child's connection to the people, places and things that are important to him (while the child is in foster care). Even though many Anderson County children are placed in adjacent counties, this has not been a barrier to the agency helping those children maintain the relationships that are important to them.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 15: Relative placement						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	50	4	50	2	0

Explanation of Item 15

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item addresses the agency's effectiveness in identifying and assessing the relatives of children in foster care as possible caregivers. In half of the cases reviewed there was evidence that both maternal and paternal

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

relatives were assessed as placement options for the children in foster care. In the half rated as needing improvement the focus appeared to be on the mother's family, to the exclusion of the father's family.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	57	3	43	3	0

Explanation of Item 16

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This item addresses the agency's effectiveness in promoting or maintaining a strong emotionally supportive relationship between children in care and their parents. Most of the relevant cases showed parental involvement based on the needs of the child rather than merely meeting the minimum visitation requirement. This item was rated as needing improvement because reviewers found instances of fathers contacting the group homes caring for their children in an attempt to maintain their relationship with their child. However, the efforts of those fathers were not supported by the agency or the group homes.

Section Five

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

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	70	3	30	0	0
Treatment	4	40	6	60	0	0
Total Cases	11	55	9	45	0	0

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

Explanation of Item 17

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? Much of the problem affecting this item is systemic, as described by the stakeholder quoted below. Treatment cases were more likely to be rated as needing improvement because many of the children in those cases were removed from their parents and placed with relatives. However, the needs of those relative caregivers were not consistently assessed or addressed.

Stakeholder Comments: “Anderson County has many service gaps – especially transportation, which is a huge issue. In addition, this is a high poverty area, with very high unemployment. People have to commute to Spartanburg and other cities, and gas prices are very high.”

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Well Being Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	80	2	20		0
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	0
Total Cases	7	39	11	61	2	0

Explanation of Item 18

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. Foster Care cases rated higher (80% strength) than Treatment cases (50% strength). During the period under review, there was significant worker turnover in the Treatment area. During the onsite visit, there were several recently hired workers awaiting certification training. Other contributing factors were large caseloads, supervisors having to assume vacant caseloads and the difficulty of the cases (a large percentage of cases involving parents who were difficult to locate).

Stakeholder Comments: “The caseworkers have their hands full. The caseworkers are overwhelmed trying to keep up, and there is a lot of paperwork... They do a great job, given the problems with resources and staffing.”

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Well Being Item 19: Worker visits with child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	0
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0	0
Total Cases	16	80	4	20	0	0

Explanation of Item 19

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. This rating is based on two questions: 1) Were Anderson DSS staff visiting children according to policy; and 2) Did the visits focus on issues related to the treatment plan? With one exception, the children in foster care were seen each month. However, only 70% of the children in treatment cases were seen each month. The children in treatment cases were sometimes divided up among different relatives. Some children in treatment cases had not been seen in several consecutive months.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Well Being Item 20: Worker visits with parent(s)						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	71	2	29	3	0
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	0
Total Cases	10	59	7	41	3	0

Explanation of Item 20

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. Parents were not seen monthly for the same reason the children were not seen monthly. The conditions described in Items 17-19 above apply equally to this item.

Section Six

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

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Well Being Item 21: Educational needs of child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	100	0	0	4	0
Treatment	4	50	4	50	2	0
Total Cases	10	71	4	29	6	0

Explanation of Item 21

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson 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 all of the foster care cases reviewed. Half of the treatment cases reviewed had significant deficiencies in this area. Either the educational needs of the children were not assessed, or there was no follow up on the problems identified.

Section Seven

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

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Well Being Item 22: Physical health of the child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	0
Treatment	4	40	6	60	0	0
Total Cases	13	65	7	35	0	0

Explanation of Item 22

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. Generally, the medical needs of children in foster care were properly addressed. The medical needs of most of the children in treatment cases were either not assessed, or when assessed, not addressed. Failure to follow up occurred even in cases involving parents who were known to be negligent in attending to their children’s medical needs.

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Well Being Item 23: Mental health of the child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	100	0	0	2	0
Treatment	2	33	4	67	4	0
Total Cases	10	71	4	29	6	0

Explanation of Item 23

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. The mental health needs of children in foster care were generally addressed. Mental health needs in treatment cases were in most cases not adequately addressed (33%). The lack of adequate documentation was a consistent problem. Reviewers had difficulty finding documentation to confirm if a child had been referred to counseling. Even when staff identified significant mental health needs of children within their cases, those needs sometimes went unmet.

Mental Health Stakeholder: The identification process (for mental health needs) is not consistent; they (workers) do not know how children are screened for mental health interventions.

Section Eight – Foster Home Licenses

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. There has been turnover in the Foster Home Licensing position and this has negatively impacted Anderson County’s ability to recruit new foster parents and to retain existing foster parents. Additionally, Foster Home Licensing files were lacking numerous documents and were not organized. All of the reviewed cases had deficiencies.

Section Nine – Unfounded Investigations

	Yes	No
Investigation initiated timely?	5	0
Was assessment adequate?	1	4
Was decision appropriate?	2	3

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. Inadequate assessments failed to obtain critical information from other parties, like law enforcement, schools, and medical care providers. Without that information the decision to unfound was not supported by the evidence in the file. Poor documentation was likely affected by dictation that occurred months after the action dates.

Determination fact sheets were either not completed, not in files, or not mailed to clients. Some clients were not notified of the agency's decision regarding their investigation.

Section Ten – Screened Out Intakes

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Anderson DSS. CAPSS showed that Anderson County screened out two of 67 intakes during the six month period under review. These numbers do not represent the total number of intakes received. A supervisor explained that not all screened out intakes were entered. Consequently, it was not possible to determine the overall accuracy of the screen out decisions.

**Anderson County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
January 2007**

Anderson Case Rating Summary – Foster Care & Treatment Combined							
	Performance 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.				14/17 = 82%	1/17 = 6%	2/17 = 12%	3
Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	8/8 = 100%		12				
Item 2: Repeat maltreatment	12/15 = 80%	3/15 = 20%	5				
Outcome S2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.				15/20 = 75%	3/20 = 15%	2/20 = 10%	
Item 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	11/12 = 92%	1/12 = 8%	6				
Item 4: Risk of harm to child(ren)	14/19 = 74%	5/19 = 26%	1				
Outcome P1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.				2/10 = 20%	7/10 = 70%	1/10 = 10%	
Item 5: Foster care re-entries			10				
Item 6: Stability of foster care placement	8/10 = 80%	2/10 = 20%					
Item 7: Permanency goal for child	6/10 = 60%	4/10 = 40%					
Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	1/4 = 25%	3/4 = 75%	6				
Item 9: Adoption		5/5 = 100%	5				
Item 10: Permanency goal of Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	1/1 = 100%		9				
Outcome P2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.				9/10 = 90%	1/10 = 10%		
Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement	5/6 = 84%	1/6 = 16%	4				
Item 12: Placement with siblings	8/9 = 89%	1/9 = 11%	1				
Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	6/8 = 75%	2/8 = 25%	2				
Item 14: Preserving connections	4/4 = 100%		6				
Item 15: Assessment of relatives as placement options	7/10 = 70%	3/10 = 30%					
Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents	4/5 = 80%	1/5 = 20%	5				
Outcome WB1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.				9/20 = 45%	8/20 = 40%	3/20 = 15%	
Item 17: Needs & services of child, parents, & caregivers	12/20 = 60%	8/20 = 40%					
Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning	13/20 = 65%	7/20 = 35%					
Item 19: Worker visits with child(ren)	13/20 = 65%	7/20 = 35%					
Item 20: Worker visits with parents	9/15 = 60%	6/15 = 40%	5				
Outcome WB2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.				9/15 = 60%	4/15 = 27%	2/15 = 13%	8
Item 21: Educational needs of the child(ren)	9/15 = 60%	6/15 = 40%	5				
Outcome WB3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.				14/20 = 70%	3/20 = 15%	3/20 = 15%	
Item 22: Physical health of the child	15/20 = 75%	5/20 = 25%					
Item 23: Mental health of the child	13/17 = 77%	4/17 = 23%	3				