

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**

During the week of September 18-22, 2006 a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an on-site review of child welfare services in Greenwood 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, DSS attorney, Alcohol and Drug Treatment Center, Family Court, Foster Parent, representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health, Sheriff's Office and Guardian Ad Litem.)

**Period included in Case Record Review: March 1, 2006 to August 31, 2006**

**Period included in Outcome Measures: September 1, 2005 to August 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 (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.

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**

Section One

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

**Summary of Findings**

**Overall Finding: Substantially Achieved**

-Safety Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations. **Finding: Area Needing Improvement**

-Safety Item 2: Repeat maltreatment.

**Finding: Strength**

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: 09/1/05 to 08/31/06

|           | Number of Reports Accepted | Number of Investigations Initiated Timely | Number of Investigations Objective $\geq 99.99\%^*$ | Number of Investigations Above (Below) Objective |
|-----------|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| State     | 16,337                     | 15,770                                    | 16,335.37   | -565.37  |
| Greenwood | 122                        | 120                                       | 121.99  | -1.99  |

\* 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 | 8              | 0 |
| Treatment   | 5        | 100 | 0                        | 0 | 5              | 0 |
| Total Cases | 7        | 100 | 0                        | 0 | 13             | 0 |

**Explanation of Item 1**

**This is an “Area Needing Improvement” for Greenwood DSS.** State law requires that an investigation of all accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. Although each of the cases reviewed onsite were rated “Strength” for this item, the August 2006 outcome report shows that Greenwood DSS initiated 120 of its 122 investigations within the required timeframe. This outcome allows no margin of error.

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 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 March 1, 2005 and February 28, 2006

|           | 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     | 10,134                  | 73  | 9515.83                                | 545.17                                     |
| Greenwood | 71                      | 2   | 66.67                                  | 2.33                                       |

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 | 2        | 100 | 0                        | 0  | 8              | 0 |
| Treatment   | 7        | 88  | 1                        | 12 | 2              | 0 |
| Total Cases | 9        | 90  | 1                        | 10 | 10             | 0 |

**Explanation of Item 2**

**This is a “Strength” for Greenwood DSS.** Outcome Measure data shows a low incidence of repeat maltreatment between March 1, 2005 and February 28, 2006 for Greenwood. Although this is generally a strong area for Greenwood, there was repeat maltreatment in one of the 10 treatment cases reviewed onsite. That treatment case had an indicated case within a few months of the first report. In the first report the treatment case was indicated on 2-18-06 for educational neglect. The case record contained no treatment activities since the date of case indication. Subsequently, a second report was taken on 5-18-06 for the same allegations and the children were taken into emergency protective custody. Adequate services had not been put in place to prevent the second report. In 100% of the foster care cases reviewed there was no repeat maltreatment. Overall this suggests that interventions by the agency were effective despite the one repeat maltreatment.

Stakeholder comment:

“The agency is very effective at keeping children safely in the home.”

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**

**Section Two**

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

**Summary of Findings**

**Overall Finding: Not Achieved**

-Safety Item 3: Services to prevent removal. **Finding: Area Needing Improvement**  
 -Safety Item 4: Risk of harm to child (ren). **Finding: Area Needing Improvement**

Analysis of Safety Item 3 Findings

| <b><u>Site Visit Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings                                   |          |     |                          |    |                |   |
|--|----------|-----|--------------------------|----|----------------|---|
| <b>Safety Item 3:</b> Services to family to protect child (ren) in home and prevent removal. |          |     |                          |    |                |   |
|  | Strength |     | Area Needing Improvement |    | Not Applicable |   |
|  | #        | %   | #                        | %  | #              | % |
| Foster Care  | 2        | 100 | 0                        | 0  | 8              | 0 |
| Treatment  | 8        | 80  | 2                        | 20 | 0              | 0 |
| Total Cases  | 10       | 83  | 2                        | 17 | 8              | 0 |

**Item 3**

**This is an “Area Needing Improvement for Greenwood DSS.** Onsite review indicates that 2 out of the 10 treatment cases reviewed services in the home were not adequate. For instance, the review found that in one treatment case, the record contained no treatment activities or services documented from the indicated date of 2-18-06 until 5-23-06. In the other treatment case the documentation supports that the father is involve in the care of the child and he admitted to smoking marijuana. The reviewer found no documentation to support that the father was referred for a drug assessment. In 100% of the foster care cases, the review found that services to families to protect children were adequate. Overall, the review found the agency practice in assessing substance abuse parents was not always thorough. There was not consistent follow-up to ensure that the parents had a drug assessment and appropriate services were being provided.

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006  
Analysis of Safety Item 4 Findings**

| <b><u>Site Visit Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings |          |     |                          |    |                |   |
|--|----------|-----|--------------------------|----|----------------|---|
| <b>Safety Item 4:</b> Risk of harm.                        |          |     |                          |    |                |   |
|  | Strength |     | Area Needing Improvement |    | Not Applicable |   |
|  | #        | %   | #                        | %  | #              | % |
| Foster Care  | 10       | 100 | 0                        | 0  | 0              | 0 |
| Treatment  | 7        | 70  | 3                        | 30 | 0              | 0 |
| Total Cases  | 17       | 85  | 3                        | 15 | 0              | 0 |

| <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 Rept 02/01/05 to 01/31/06 | Number With Another Rept Within 6 Months of Unfounded Determination | Number of Cases Met Objective >= 91.50%* | Number of Cases Above (Below) Objective |
| State   | 14,996   | 1,137   | 13,721.34                                | 137.66                                  |
| Greenwood   | 99   | 4   | 90.59                                    | 4.41                                    |

\* This is a DSS established objective.

**Explanation of “Risk of Harm” measure**

**This is an “Area Needing Improvement” for Greenwood DSS.** According to the Outcome Measure Report, Greenwood County met the agency established objective for this outcome. The report indicates that Greenwood had 99 unfounded reports from March 1, 2005 thru February 28, 2006. Out of those reports, only 4 had another report within 6 months of the unfounded determinations. The onsite reviewers found that 3 of the 10 treatment cases reviewed, services in the home were not adequate. Therefore, risk of harm in the home had not been adequately reduced. All 10 of the foster care cases reviewed, risk of harm was reduced.

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**

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 placemt.    | <b>Finding: Strength</b>                  |
| -Item 7: Permanency goal for child            | <b>Finding: Strength</b>                  |
| -Item 8: Reunification, plmt w/ relatives     | <b>Findings: Strength</b>                 |
| -Item 9: Adoption                             | <b>Findings: Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| -Item 10: Perm goal of other planned arrangmt | <b>Findings: Strength</b>                 |

**Analysis of Safety Permanency Item 5 Findings**

|  |          |     |                          |   |                |   |
|--|----------|-----|--------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| <b><u>Site Visit Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings |          |     |                          |   |                |   |
| <b>Permanency Item 5:</b> Foster care re-entries.          |          |     |                          |   |                |   |
|  | Strength |     | Area Needing Improvement |   | Not Applicable |   |
|  | #        | %   | #                        | % | #              | % |
| Foster Care  | 2        | 100 | 0                        | 0 | 8              | 0 |

**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 09/01/05 to 08/31/06 | 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     | 3,403  | 237   | 3,110.34                                | 55.66                                      |
| Greenwood | 20   | 0   | 18.28                                   | 1.72                                       |

\* This is a federally established objective.

**Explanation**

**Foster Care Re-entries is a “Strength” for Greenwood DSS.** Outcome measure data indicates that Greenwood County had no foster care re-entries. None of the cases reviewed onsite involved a child re-entering foster care.

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**

Analysis of Safety Permanency Item 6 Findings

| <b>Site Visit Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings           |          |    |                          |    |                |   |
|---|----------|----|--------------------------|----|----------------|---|
| <b>Permanency Item 6:</b> Stability of foster care placement. |          |    |                          |    |                |   |
|   | Strength |    | Area Needing Improvement |    | Not Applicable |   |
|   | #        | %  | #                        | %  | #              | % |
| Foster Care   | 9        | 90 | 1                        | 10 | 0              | 0 |

| <b>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</b>   |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Measure P3.2: <b>Stability of Foster Care Placement</b> – 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  | 3,908  | 3,032   | 3,388.24                                      | -281.24                                    |
| Greenwood  | 23   | 22  | 19.94   | 2.06                                       |

Note: This is a federally established objective.

**Explanation**

**This is a “Strength” for Greenwood.** The outcome report shows that 23 of the 22 children (96%) in care less than 12 months had no more than 2 foster care placements. This is above the standard of 86.7%. Therefore, Greenwood County met this measure. Nine of the ten cases reviewed onsite were rated “Strength” for stability.

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**  
Analysis of Safety Permanency Item 7 Findings

**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<br>09/05 –08/06 | Number Children With TPR Complaint | Number of Children Objective<br>≥ 53.00%* | Number of Children Above (Below) Objective |
|-----------|--|------------------------------------|---|--|
| State     | 3,617  | 1,638                              | 1,917.01                                  | -279.01                                    |
| Greenwood | 34   | 15                                 | 44.12                                     | -3.02                                      |

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

**Site Visit Findings** Performance Item Ratings

**Permanency Item 7:** Permanency goal for children.

|             | Strength |     | Area Needing Improvement |   | Not Applicable |   |
|-------------|----------|-----|--------------------------|---|----------------|---|
|             | #        | %   | #                        | % | #              | % |
| Foster Care | 10       | 100 | 0                        | 0 | 0              | 0 |

**Explanation of Item 7**

**This is a “Strength” for Greenwood DSS.** Reviewers found that Greenwood DSS did a good job in determining the most appropriate permanency plan for the children in their care. All cases reviewed were rated “Strength”. The outcome report shows that TPR actions were not filed timely on all appropriate cases. That deficiency is addressed in the discussion of item 9.



**Greenwood County DSS**  
**Child Welfare Services Review**  
**September 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 09/01/05–08/31/06 | Number of Children In Care Less Than 12 Months | Number Of Children Objective >= 76.20%* | Number of Children Above (Below) Objective |
| State   | 2,408  | 1,969  | 1,834.90                                | 134.10                                     |
| Greenwood   | 15   | 15   | 11.43                                   | 3.57                                       |

\* 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   | 1        | 100 | 0                        | 0 | 9              | 0 |

**Explanation**

**This is a “Strength” for Greenwood DSS.** All of the children who entered care during the 12 month reporting period returned home within 12 months of entering foster care. The review found that the child with a plan of return home or with a relative was appropriate.

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 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 W/in 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  | 436  | 69  | 139.52  | -70.52                                     |
| Greenwood  | 2  | 0   | 0.64  | -0.64                                      |

Note: This is a federally established objective.

| <b><u>Site Visit Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings |          |    |                          |    |                |   |
|--|----------|----|--------------------------|----|----------------|---|
| <b>Permanency Item 9: Adoption.</b>                        |          |    |                          |    |                |   |
|  | Strength |    | Area Needing Improvement |    | Not Applicable |   |
|  | #        | %  | #                        | %  | #              | % |
| Foster Care  | 1        | 33 | 2                        | 67 | 7              | 0 |

**Explanation**

**This is an “Area Needing Improvement”.** According to the outcome report no adoptions were completed within the 24 months of the child entering foster care. This is consistent with the review findings onsite.

One of the three cases with the plan of adoption was on track to be finalized within 24 months. The other two cases with the plan of adoption were not finalized due to TPR pleadings not filed timely.

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**

Analysis of Permanency Item 10 Findings

| <b><u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u></b>  |   |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| Measure P3.6: <b>Permanency Goal of “Other Planned Living Arrangement”</b> – 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 09/01/05 – 08/31/06 | 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  | 8,355   | 1,475  | 7,101.75                                | -221.75                                    |
| Greenwood  | 38  | 8  | 32.30                                   | -2.30                                      |

\* This is a DSS established objective.

| <b><u>Site Visit Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings                                |          |     |                          |   |                |   |
|---|----------|-----|--------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| <b>Permanency Item 10:</b> Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement. |          |     |                          |   |                |   |
|   | Strength |     | Area Needing Improvement |   | Not Applicable |   |
|   | #        | %   | #                        | % | #              | % |
| Foster Care   | 5        | 100 | 0                        | 0 | 5              | 0 |

**Explanation**

**This is a “Strength” for Greenwood DSS.** The outcome data shows 8 of the 38 children in Greenwood DSS custody had this plan. The county fell short of the agency standard by 6 percentage points. Five of the ten cases reviewed onsite had APPLA as a permanency plan. The plan was appropriate in each case. The children were between 16 and 18 years old. Case documentation supports that Independent Living skill services are being provided to the youths as required by policy. In two of those cases the youths will graduate from high school in 2007.

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**

Section Four

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

**Summary of Findings**

**Overall Finding:**

- Item 11: Proximity of placement
- Item 12: Placement with siblings.
- Item 13: Visiting w/ parents & siblings
- Item 14: Preserving connections
- Item 15: Relative placement
- Item 16: Relationship of child w/ parents

**Substantially Achieved**

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

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<br>09/01/05 –<br>08/31/06 | Number of Children Placed Within<br>County of Origin | Percent of Children Placed Within<br>County of Origin | Number of Children Objective<br>>= 70.00%* | Number of Children Above<br>(Below)<br>Objective |
|-----------|--|--|---|--|--|
| State     | 6,221  | 3,886  | 62.47   | 4,354.70                                   | -4678.70   |
| Greenwood | 38   | 29   | 76.32   | 26.60                                      | 2.40   |

\* This is a DSS established objective.

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**

| <u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings            |          |     |                          |   |                |   |
|--|----------|-----|--------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| <b>Permanency Item 11:</b> Proximity of foster care placement. |          |     |                          |   |                |   |
|  | Strength |     | Area Needing Improvement |   | Not Applicable |   |
|  | #        | %   | #                        | % | #              | % |
| Foster Care  | 9        | 100 | 0                        | 0 | 1              | 0 |

**Explanation**

**This is a “Strength” for Greenwood DSS.** To meet this objective 70%, or more, of the children in care must be placed in Greenwood County. According to the Outcome Measure report, 76% (29 of 38) of the children in foster care were placed in the county. The onsite review found that 100% of the foster children reviewed were either placed within Greenwood County or in close proximity to their community in an adjacent county.

| <u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings |          |     |                          |   |                |   |
|---|----------|-----|--------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| <b>Permanency Item 12:</b> Placement with siblings  |          |     |                          |   |                |   |
|   | Strength |     | Area Needing Improvement |   | Not Applicable |   |
|   | #        | %   | #                        | % | #              | % |
| Foster Care   | 3        | 100 | 0                        | 0 | 7              | 0 |

**Explanation**

**This is “Strength” for Greenwood DSS.** The review found that Greenwood DSS does a very good job of in placing siblings together and within in the same county or community whenever possible. One case reviewed onsite involved a sibling group of three. Two of the siblings were placed together. The third sibling was placed in outside the county due to the child’s need for therapeutic placement.

| <u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings                          |          |     |                          |   |                |   |
|--|----------|-----|--------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| <b>Permanency Item 13:</b> Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care |          |     |                          |   |                |   |
|  | Strength |     | Area Needing Improvement |   | Not Applicable |   |
|  | #        | %   | #                        | % | #              | % |
| Foster Care  | 5        | 100 | 0                        | 0 | 5              | 0 |

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**

**Explanation**

**This is a “Strength for Greenwood DSS.”** Reviewers determined that visits with parents and siblings in foster care occurred on a regular basis. The agency put forth great efforts to assist the families with maintaining contact.

| <b><u>Site Visit Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings |          |     |                          |   |                |   |
|--|----------|-----|--------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| <b>Permanency Item 14: Preserving connections</b>          |          |     |                          |   |                |   |
|  | Strength |     | Area Needing Improvement |   | Not Applicable |   |
|  | #        | %   | #                        | % | #              | % |
| Foster Care  | 7        | 100 | 0                        | 0 | 3              | 0 |

**Explanation**

**This is “Strength”.** This item addresses the agency’s ability to preserve a child in foster care’s connection to his/her community, family, and faith. Preserving connections was rated strength in 100 % of the foster care cases reviewed. Greenwood does a very good job of preserving the relationships that are important to children in foster care. Reviewers saw many examples of relatives and parental involvement in their children’s lives beyond the minimum required visitation. There were also examples of the county promoting visits between siblings not placed together and other contacts with the adult siblings via emails and phone calls.

| <b><u>Site Visit Findings</u></b> Performance Item Ratings |          |    |                          |    |                |   |
|--|----------|----|--------------------------|----|----------------|---|
| <b>Permanency Item 15: Relative placement</b>              |          |    |                          |    |                |   |
|  | Strength |    | Area Needing Improvement |    | Not Applicable |   |
|  | #        | %  | #                        | %  | #              | % |
| Foster Care  | 6        | 67 | 3                        | 33 | 1              | 0 |

**Explanation**

**This is an “Area Needing Improvement” for Greenwood DSS.** This item addresses the agency’s effectiveness in identifying and assessing the relatives of children in foster care as possible caregivers. In 67% of the cases reviewed there was evidence that both maternal and paternal relatives were assessed as placement options for the children in foster care. In three of the nine cases reviewed there was no evidence that paternal relatives were assessed.

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**

| <b>Site Visit Findings</b> Performance Item Ratings                   |          |     |                          |   |                |   |
|---|----------|-----|--------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| <b>Permanency Item 16:</b> Relationship of child in care with parents |          |     |                          |   |                |   |
|   | Strength |     | Area Needing Improvement |   | Not Applicable |   |
|   | #        | %   | #                        | % | #              | % |
| Foster Care   | 3        | 100 | 0                        | 0 | 7              | 0 |

**Explanation**

**This is a “Strength for Greenwood DSS”.** This item addresses the agency’s effectiveness in promoting or maintaining a strong emotionally supportive relationship between children in care and their parents.

The onsite review determined in all three cases reviewed that visitation was occurring frequently and the children were bonded with the parent. Reviewers saw many examples of relatives and parental involvement in their children’s lives beyond the minimum required visitation.

**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)

**Partially Achieved**

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

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**

| <u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings                             |          |    |                          |    |                |   |
|---|----------|----|--------------------------|----|----------------|---|
| <b>Well Being Item 17:</b> Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents |          |    |                          |    |                |   |
|   | Strength |    | Area Needing Improvement |    | Not Applicable |   |
|   | #        | %  | #                        | %  | #              | % |
| Foster Care   | 8        | 80 | 2                        | 20 | 0              | 0 |
| Treatment   | 7        | 70 | 3                        | 30 | 0              | 0 |
| Total Cases   | 15       | 75 | 5                        | 25 | 0              | 0 |

**Explanation**

This is an “**Area Needing Improvement**” for Greenwood DSS. This item asks two questions: 1) Were the needs of the child, parents, and foster parents assessed, and 2) Did the agency take steps to meet the identified needs?

This measure was rated strength in 70% of the treatment cases and in 80% of the foster care cases reviewed. The practice most identified as needing improvement was the need for more thorough assessments of all the appropriate family members. Deficiencies were more prevalent in treatment cases than in foster care. In the three treatment cases rated an area needing improvement; documentation did not support that the parent’s needs were assessed and appropriate services were implemented.

| <u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings                      |          |    |                          |    |                |   |
|--|----------|----|--------------------------|----|----------------|---|
| <b>Well Being Item 18:</b> Child and family involvement in case planning |          |    |                          |    |                |   |
|  | Strength |    | Area Needing Improvement |    | Not Applicable |   |
|  | #        | %  | #                        | %  | #              | % |
| Foster Care  | 8        | 89 | 1                        | 10 | 1              | 0 |
| Treatment  | 8        | 80 | 2                        | 20 | 0              | 0 |
| Total Cases  | 16       | 84 | 3                        | 16 | 0              | 0 |

**Explanation**

This is an “**Area Needing Improvement**” for Greenwood DSS. Workers were more likely to involve children and parents in foster care cases in the case planning process than children and parents in treatment cases. In the two treatment cases, the practice most identified as needing improvement was the need to include all appropriate family members in the development of the case planning process.



**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**

| <u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings |          |     |                          |    |                |   |
|---|----------|-----|--------------------------|----|----------------|---|
| <b>Well Being Item 19:</b> Worker visits with child |          |     |                          |    |                |   |
|   | Strength |     | Area Needing Improvement |    | Not Applicable |   |
|   | #        | %   | #                        | %  | #              | % |
| Foster Care   | 10       | 100 | 0                        | 0  | 0              | 0 |
| Treatment   | 8        | 80  | 2                        | 20 | 0              | 0 |
| Total Cases   | 18       | 90  | 2                        | 10 | 0              | 0 |

**Explanation**

This is a **“Strength” for Greenwood DSS**. This rating is based on two questions: 1) Were Greenwood DSS staff visiting children according to policy, and 2) did the visits focus on issues related to the treatment plan? All ten cases in foster care were rated “Strength” because the children were seen monthly and the focus of those visits were on treatment planning related issues. In treatment, eight out of the ten cases was rated strength. The two treatment cases rated an Area Needing Improvement were due to monthly contacts not made each month with all of the children during the period under review.

Stakeholder comment:

“The case workers in foster care do a good job of providing face-to-face visits once a month and needs are adequately assessed.”

| <u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings     |          |    |                          |    |                |   |
|---|----------|----|--------------------------|----|----------------|---|
| <b>Well Being Item 20:</b> Worker visits with parent(s) |          |    |                          |    |                |   |
|   | Strength |    | Area Needing Improvement |    | Not Applicable |   |
|   | #        | %  | #                        | %  | #              | % |
| Foster Care   | 2        | 50 | 2                        | 50 | 6              | 0 |
| Treatment   | 8        | 80 | 2                        | 20 | 0              | 0 |
| Total Cases   | 10       | 83 | 2                        | 17 | 6              | 0 |

**Explanation**

This is an **“Area Needing Improvement” for Greenwood DSS**. In 50 percent of the foster care cases reviewed, in which items were applicable, visitation between the worker and the parents were occurring monthly. In 80 % of the treatment cases reviewed, there were monthly contacts made with the family during the period under review. In those cases the documentation supports whether the fathers were seen, or the agency’s attempts to engage him, or the agency’s attempts to locate him. The two foster care cases rated an Area Needing Improvement were due to the face-to-face contacts with both parents not

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**

occurring consistently during the period under review. Overall this is a weak area for both treatment and foster care.

Section Six

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

**Summary of Findings**

**Overall Finding:**

-Item 21: Educational needs of the child

**Substantially Achieved**

**Finding: Strength**

**Site Visit Findings** Performance Item Ratings

**Well Being Item 21:** Educational needs of child

|             | Strength |     | Area Needing Improvement |    | Not Applicable |   |
|-------------|----------|-----|--------------------------|----|----------------|---|
|             | #        | %   | #                        | %  | #              | % |
| Foster Care | 7        | 100 | 0                        | 0  | 3              | 0 |
| Treatment   | 5        | 83  | 1                        | 17 | 4              | 0 |
| Total Cases | 12       | 92  | 1                        | 8  | 7              | 0 |

**Explanation**

This is a **“Strength” for Greenwood DSS**. The review found that educational needs were adequately assessed in both treatment and foster care cases.

Reviewers saw documentation of frequent visits with children in their schools, discussions with the parents about their children’s performance in school. Copies of school records, i.e., report cards and attendance records were case files.

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

**Substantially Achieved**

**Finding: Strength**

**Finding: Strength**

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**

| <u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings     |           |           |                          |          |                |          |
|---|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|----------|----------------|----------|
| <b>Well Being Item 22:</b> Physical health of the child |           |           |                          |          |                |          |
|   | Strength  |           | Area Needing Improvement |          | Not Applicable |          |
|   | #         | %         | #                        | %        | #              | %        |
| Foster Care   | 10        | 100       | 0                        | 0        | 0              | 0        |
| Treatment   | 10        | 100       | 0                        | 0        | 0              | 0        |
| <b>Total Cases</b>                                      | <b>20</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>0</b>                 | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b> |

**Explanation**

This is a **“Strength” for Greenwood DSS**. Workers successfully documented that the physical health of the children in their cases was assessed and addressed in all of the 20 cases reviewed.

| <u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings   |           |           |                          |          |                |          |
|---|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|----------|----------------|----------|
| <b>Well Being Item 23:</b> Mental health of the child |           |           |                          |          |                |          |
|   | Strength  |           | Area Needing Improvement |          | Not Applicable |          |
|   | #         | %         | #                        | %        | #              | %        |
| Foster Care   | 7         | 88        | 1                        | 13       | 2              | 0        |
| Treatment   | 7         | 100       | 0                        | 0        | 3              | 0        |
| <b>Total Cases</b>                                    | <b>14</b> | <b>93</b> | <b>1</b>                 | <b>7</b> | <b>5</b>       | <b>0</b> |

**Explanation**

This is a **“Strength” for Greenwood DSS**. Mental health services were sought in 88% of the foster care cases and in 100% of the treatment cases when indications were that the services were needed or a more thorough mental health assessment was warranted. One foster care case and one MTS case were rated an area needing improvement because the records contained no documentation to support that the child mental health need was addressed and assessed ongoing.

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006  
Section Eight – Foster Home Licenses**

This is an **“Area Needing Improvement”** for Greenwood DSS. Licensing records were reviewed for 10 of the 16 foster homes.

1. 7-8-06 quarterly visit dictation reflects no children in the foster home but the household information does not show when the children were removed.
2. In two the licensing records, there were no sexual offender checks for July and August of 2006.
3. Both foster parents should be seen during the quarterly review visits.
4. Last sled check in the file is for 4-26-05 need current sled check for 4/2006.
5. No indication in CAPPS that the worker visited the home within 2 days before increasing the license for more children, and to check for bed space to ensure the agency is in compliance with the regulation.
6. License issued on 10/30/03 must have changed. Need license issued on 6/1/05 in the file. Unable to determine from the file why the license changed. Dictation on 6/1/06 indicates the home is approved for 4 children, reviewer found no amended form in the file.

**Section Nine – Unfounded Investigations**

|                                 | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Investigation initiated timely? | 4          | 1         |
| Was assessment adequate?        | 5          | 0         |
| Was decision appropriate?       | 5          | 0         |

**This is “Strength” for Greenwood County DSS.** The review found that all five unfounded investigations reviewed had an adequate assessment during the investigation and it appeared that the decision to unfound the report was appropriate. The initial contact was not made timely in one of the five investigations. In that case, the reviewer noted that the response time assigned was 2– 12 hours. According to the dictation, the initial contact was made in 24 hours.

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006  
Section Ten – Screened Out Intakes**

|  | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>Cannot Determine</b> |
|--|------------|-----------|-------------------------|
| Was Intake Appropriately Screened Out? | 8          | 2         | 0                       |
|  | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>Not Applicable</b>   |
| Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?  | 0          | 0         | 10                      |
| Were Appropriate Referrals Made?       | 1          | 0         | 9                       |

**This is an “Area Needing Improvement” for Greenwood County DSS.**

Out of the ten referrals reviewed the reviewer determined that two of those referrals were not appropriately screened-out. In one referral, the alleged perpetrator was the caretaker of the child and there were specific allegations of abuse or neglect in that screened report. In the other referral, the agency had received multiple reports on that family involving the same victim child and the alleged perpetrator. Also, there were significant maltreatment issues in the report that required the referral to be accepted and investigated.

**Greenwood County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
September 2006**

**Case Rating Summary**

The performance and outcome ratings below show the number of cases receiving that rating, followed by the percent of the total that number represents. Not Applicable (N/A) cases do not factor in the percentage.

| Performance Item or Outcome   | 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.                 |                    |                          |      | 11 (92%)               | 1(8%)              |              | 8    |
| Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment                | 7 (100%)           | 0                        | 13   |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 2: Repeat maltreatment   | 9(90%)             | 1 (10%)                  |      |                        |                    |              |      |
| Outcome S2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.    |                    |                          |      | 17 (85%)               | 1 (5%)             | 2(10%)       | 0    |
| Item 3: Services to family to protect child (ren) in home and prevent removal                   | 10 (83%)           | 2(17%)                   | 8    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 4: Risk of harm to child (ren)   | 17 (85%)           | 3 (15%)                  | 0    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Outcome P1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.                  |                    |                          |      | 8 (80%)                | 2 (20%)            | 0            | 0    |
| Item 5: Foster care re-entries  | 2 (100%)           | 0                        | 8    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 6: Stability of foster care placement  | 9 (90%)            | 1(10%)                   | 0    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 7: Permanency goal for child   | 10 (100%)          | 0                        | 0    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives                      | 1 (100%)           | 0                        | 9    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 9: Adoption  | 1(33%)             | 2(67%)                   | 7    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 10: Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement                          | 5 (100%)           | 0                        | 5    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Outcome P2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.   |                    |                          |      | 10(100%)               | 0                  | 0            | 0    |
| Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement   | 9 (100%)           | 0                        | 1    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 12: Placement with siblings  | 3 (100%)           | 0                        | 7    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care                                      | 5 (100%)           |                          | 5    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 14: Preserving connections   | 7(100%)            |                          | 3    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 15: Relative placement   | 6(67%)             | 3(33%)                   | 1    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents   | 3(100)             | 0                        | 7    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Outcome WB1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.             |                    |                          |      | 14(70%)                | 5(25%)             | 1(5%)        | 0    |
| Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents                                   | 15(75%)            | 5(25%)                   | 0    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning  | 16(84%)            | 3(16%)                   | 1    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 19: Worker visits with child   | 18(90%)            | 2(10%)                   | 0    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 20: Worker visits with parent(s)   | 10(71%)            | 4(28%)                   | 6    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Outcome WB2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.             |                    |                          |      | 12 (92%)               | 0                  | 1(8%)        | 7    |
| Item 21: Educational needs of the child   | 12 (92%)           | 1 (8%)                   | 7    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Outcome WB3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs. |                    |                          |      | 19 (95%)               | 1(5%)              | 0            | 0    |
| Item 22: Physical health of the child   | 20 (100%)          | 0                        | 0    |                        |                    |              |      |
| Item 23: Mental health of the child   | 14 (93%)           | 1 (7%)                   | 5    |                        |                    |              |      |