

Berkeley County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
February 2008

During the week of February 25-29, 2008 a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Berkeley 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, Berkeley DSS supervisors, representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

**Period under Review: February 1, 2007 to January 31, 2008**

### **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. Agency data 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.

Berkeley County DSS  
 Child Welfare Services Review  
 February 2008

**Ratings**

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

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

The county's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of two items:

- |  |                                 |
|--|---------------------------------|
| 1) Timeliness of initiating investigations | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| 2) Repeat Maltreatment                     | <b>Strength</b>                 |

<b>Agency Data</b>				
<b>Performance Measure 1: Initiating CPS Investigations</b>				
Objective: 100% in <= 24 hours (state law)				
	Number of Investigations	Number of Investigations Initiated Timely	Percent of Investigations Initiated Timely	Number of Investigations Above (Below) Objective
State	18,824	17,791	94.5	(1,033)
Berkeley	827	768	92.9	(59)

**Explanation of Item 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all (100%) accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. Agency data indicates that for the 12 month period under review, Berkeley initiated 768 of its 827 investigations of alleged abuse and neglect within 24 hours.

Berkeley County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
February 2008

<b>Agency Data</b>				
<b>Performance Measure 3: Treatment Cases With No New Indicated Reports – Of all treatment cases that were closed during the year reporting period, what percentage did Not have a new founded intake within 12 months of the treatment case being closed?</b>				
Objective: $\geq 87.55\%$ Agency Average				
	Number of Treatment Cases Closed	Number of Treatment Cases with no founded intake within 12 months	Percent of Treatment Cases that did not have a new founded intake within 12 months	Number of Cases Above (Below) State Average
State	4,948	4,332	87.55	N/A
Berkeley	161	144	89.44	3.0

**Explanation of Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment**

This is an area of **Strength** for Berkeley DSS. This item measures the occurrence of maltreatment among children under agency supervision, or within a year of having their case closed by the agency. Agency data shows that 89.44% of the treatment cases closed were not involved in a subsequent indicated incident of maltreatment. Based on agency data, Berkeley surpassed the state average for this item. The onsite review confirmed that children under agency supervision rarely experienced additional maltreatment.

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

The county's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of two items:

- 3) Services to family to protect children and prevent removal     **Area Needing Improvement**
- 4) Risk of Harm     **Area Needing Improvement**

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Safety Item 3: Services to Family to Protect Children in Home and Prevent Removal.</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	40	3	60	5	0
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0	0
Total Cases	9	60	6	40	5	0

Berkeley County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
February 2008

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item assesses whether services were adequate to protect children in their home and prevent their removal and placement into foster care. Treatment cases rated higher (70% rated “Strength”) than foster care cases (40% rated “Strength”) for this item. Reviewers determined that there were delays in providing services to families and receiving reports or feedback of the parent's progress. Reviewers also found instances where families had difficulty accessing services when the services were provided in another county.

**Stakeholder Comments:** We offer psychological evaluations, mental health evaluations, on-going individual and family counseling for DSS clients. We do not offer services to perpetrators or sexual offenders.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Safety Item 4: Risk of Harm</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	0
Total Cases	13	65	7	35	0	0

**Explanation of Item 4: Risk of Harm**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item assesses whether the agency’s interventions reduced risks of harm to children. In 50% of the treatment cases, risk of harm was not adequately managed. In those cases, caseworkers clearly described serious risk factors that remained in the home, but failed to take actions needed to reduce those risk factors. The foster care cases needing improvement involved children living with parents or relatives who remained in the agency’s custody.

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

The county’s performance on this outcome is based on the rating of six items:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 5) Foster care re-entries   | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b>          |
| 6) Stability of foster care placement   | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b>          |
| 7) Permanency goal for child  | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b>          |
| 8) Reunification or permanent placement with relatives                        | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b>          |
| 9) Adoption   | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b>          |
| 10) Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA) | <b>Area Needing Improvement Strength</b> |

Berkeley County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
February 2008

<b>Agency Data</b>				
<b>Performance Measure 7: Foster Care Re-entries</b> – Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification in the 12 month period prior to the reporting period, the percent that did not re-enter foster care within 12 months of the date of their discharge.				
<b>Objective:</b> $\geq 90.1\%$ (federal standard)				
	Number Children Reunited During Reporting Period	Number of Children Discharged Who Did Not Re-enter Foster Care	Percent of Children Discharged Who Did Not Re-enter Foster Care	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	2,458	2,316	94.22	101.3
Berkeley	114	98	85.96	(4.7)

**Explanation of Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item measures the frequency of children re-entering foster care within a year of discharge. The federal standard for this measure is that 90.1% of children leaving foster care must not re-enter foster care within a year of discharged. For Berkeley DSS that percentage was 85.96.

<b>Agency Data</b>				
<b>Performance Measure 6: Stability of Foster Care Placements</b> – Of all children who had been in foster care at least 8 days but less than 12 months from the time of latest removal from home, what percentage had no more than two placement settings?				
<b>Objective:</b> $\geq 86\%$ (federal standard)				
	Foster Care Services Open > 7 days and < 12 Months	Number With No More than 2 Placements	Percent with No More than 2 Placements	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	4,321	3,438	79.56	(308.3)
Berkeley	142	119	83.80	(4.1)

**Explanation of Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placements**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item measures the frequency of placement changes for children in foster care, and assesses the reasons for those changes. The standard applied to this item is that at least 86% of children in care experience two or fewer placements during the period under review. Agency data shows that Berkeley County fell short of this standard by 2.2 percentage points. Part of the instability can be explained by the agency's decision to begin the process of closing non-compliant and inappropriate foster homes, while attempting to recruit new homes.

Berkeley County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
February 2008

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Permanency Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	60	4	40	0	0

**Explanation of Item 7: Permanency Goal for Children**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness of permanency goals for children in foster care and the timeliness of those permanency decisions. The onsite review found that 40% of the cases needed improvement for this item. Reviewers found cases with permanency plans that were not realistic based on the facts in the case. For example, there were cases with a plan of reunification for over a year even though the parents had a well established history of non-compliance.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Permanency Item 8: Reunification or Permanent Placement with Relatives</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	20	4	80	5	0

**Explanation of Item 8: Reunification or Permanent Placement with Relatives**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item evaluates the activities and processes necessary to accomplish the goal of reunification with caregivers or placement with relatives. Reviewers found that 80% of children in foster care with the plan of "Return Home" experienced legal and casework related delays that prolonged their stay in foster care. Reviewers found cases whose merit hearings were continued repeatedly, causing some children to be in care for over a year without court-sanctioned permanency plan.

**Stakeholder Comment:** This is a hard problem. The courts seem overloaded. We have seen cases in which Merits Hearing were never held. We have seen other court related delays where parents were not served notices of court hearings because the paralegal or caseworker did not indicate that a parent had moved and listed the new address.

Berkeley County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
February 2008

<b>Agency Data</b>				
<b>Measure 9: Length of Time to Finalized Adoption</b> – Of all children who left foster care due to finalized adoption during the reporting year, what percentage left foster care within 24 months from the date of their latest removal from home?				
<b>Objective:</b> >= 36.6% (federal standard)				
	Number of Adoptions Finalized	Number of Adoptions Finalized < 24 Months	Percent of Adoptions Finalized in < 24 Months	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	399	69	17.3	(77.0)
Berkeley	20	1	5.0	(6.3)

**Explanation of Item 9: Adoption**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item evaluates the process within the child welfare system to achieve timely adoptions for children in foster care. The federal standard is that at least 36.6% of adoptions be completed within 24 months of a child entering care. Agency data indicates that Berkeley County only had 5% of their adoptions completed within 24 months. The legal and casework process delays described in Item 8 above also created significant delays in the adoption process for children in care. Reviewers saw delays in filing petitions, delays in John Doe publications, and continued hearings in every case involving children with the plan of Adoption.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Permanency Item 10: Permanency Goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	100	0	0	9	0

**Explanation of Item 10: Permanency Goal of APPLA**

This is area of **Strength** for Berkeley DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness and effectiveness of services provided to children with the permanency plan of APPLA. Reviewers found that children with this plan were receiving appropriate independent living services.

Berkeley County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
February 2008

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

The county's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of six items:

- |   |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 11) Proximity of foster care placement                | <b>Strength</b>                 |
| 12) Placement with siblings in foster care            | <b>Strength</b>                 |
| 13) Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| 14) Preserving connections                            | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| 15) Relative placement                                | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| 16) Relationship of child in care with parents        | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |

**Onsite Review Findings**

**Permanency Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement**

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	9	100	0	0	1	0

**Explanation of Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement**

This is an area of **Strength** for Berkeley County DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep children close enough to their families so that essential relationships can be maintained. One measure used to evaluate this item is the percentage of children who are placed within the county. The objective is at least 70% of the children in care be placed within the county. Agency data shows that 74.7% of Berkeley DSS children were placed within the county. Onsite reviewers found that most children placed out-of-county were in specialized placements to address their therapeutic needs.

**Onsite Review Findings**

**Permanency Item 12: Placement with Siblings**

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

**Explanation of Item 12: Placement with Siblings in Foster Care**

This is an area of **Strength** for Berkeley DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep siblings together when it is appropriate to do so. Reviewers found that, in every instance, the agency kept sibling groups together when it was in the children's best interest. The agency used group homes to keep some older sibling groups together.



Berkeley County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
February 2008

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Permanency Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	43	4	57	3	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to ensure that visits occur between children in foster care and their siblings and parents. In half of the cases visits occurred according to agency policy. Visits were usually arranged between children and their mothers. The agency fell short of the 90% objective because workers failed to explain why they were not working with the fathers of children in care.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Permanency Item 14: Preserving Connections</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	50	3	50	6	0

**Explanation of Item 14: Preserving Connections**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. Whereas Item 13 addressed parents and siblings, this item evaluates the agency's efforts to preserve children's connections to the people, places and things that are important to them. Half of the cases reviewed revealed that the agency's efforts to preserve connections were limited to the children's mothers, to the exclusion of other important relationships.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Permanency Item 15: Relative Placement</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	56	4	44	1	0

Berkeley County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
February 2008

**Explanation of Item 15: Relative Placement**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to identify and assess relatives as potential placement resources for children in foster care. In 44% of the cases reviewed, this area needed improvement. Reviewers found instances of relatives who expressed interest in caring for children, but no evidence that those relatives were assessed. Reviewers also found that relatives of the custodial parent (usually the mother) were assessed, but relatives of the non-custodial parent (usually the father) were not assessed.

**Onsite Review Findings**

**Permanency Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents**

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	60	2	40	5	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to promote a supportive relationship between children in care and their parents, beyond the twice minimum visitation requirement. In 40% of the cases, this item needed improvement. In those cases reviewers did not find increased parental involvement when the needs of children clearly called for it – for example, with preschool aged children, and with children who were to return home within a few weeks.

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

The county's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of four items:

- |   |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 17) Needs and services of child, parents and caregivers | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| 18) Child and family involvement in case planning       | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| 19) Worker visits with child                            | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| 20) Worker visits with parents                          | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |

Berkeley County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
February 2008

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Well Being Item 17: Needs and Services of Child, Parents, Foster Parents</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0
Treatment	3	30	7	70	0	0
Total Cases	11	55	9	45	0	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley 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? In 80% of foster care cases and 30% of the treatment cases, this item was rated strength. The most common deficiencies were a) failure to address the needs of alternative caregivers, and b) failure to assess non-custodial parents and paramours who were significant persons in the child's life.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Well Being Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	50	5	50	0	0
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	0
Total Cases	10	50	10	50	0	0

**Explanation of Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in case Planning**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. Reviewers found that involving parents and age-appropriate children in case planning was evident in 50% of the cases reviewed. In the other half of the cases, workers write the treatment plan and go over it with the parents before asking that the plan be signed. Reviewers saw evidence that the agency was beginning to conduct family planning meetings.

Berkeley County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
February 2008

<b>Agency Data</b>				
<b>Well Being Item 19: Face-to-Face Visits with Children (&lt;18 years of age)</b>				
Objective: 100% (Agency Policy)				
	Number of Children Under Agency Supervision at Least One Complete Calendar Month	Number of Children Visited Every Month	Percent of Children Visited Every Month	Children Without a Documented Face-to-Face Visit Every Month
Foster Care	190	175	92.11	(15)
Treatment	897	495	55.18	(402)

**Explanation of Item 19: Face-to-Face Visits with Children**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with children under agency supervision, and evaluates the quality of those visits. Children in foster care cases were much more likely to be seen each month than children in treatment cases. Reviewers found instances in which visit did occur, but the content of the visits did not address safety, permanency and well being issues. Reviewers also found instances of workers who attempted to see the victim child each month, but failed to make face-to-face contact with the other children in the home to assess their safety.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Well Being Item 20: Worker Visits with Parent(s)</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	17	5	83	4	0
Treatment	4	40	6	60	0	0
Total Cases	5	31	11	69	4	0

**Explanation of Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with parents, and evaluates the quality of those visits. For this item, treatment cases rated higher than foster care cases (treatment cases - 60% needing improvement; foster care cases - 83% needing improvement). Overall, 69% of the cases reviewed were rated needing improvement. In many instances, case records contained no explanation for why the agency did not attempt to involve the fathers of children in care.

Berkeley County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
February 2008

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

The county's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of one item:

21) Educational need of the child **Strength**

**Onsite Review Findings**

**Well Being Item 21: Educational Needs of Child**

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	88	1	14	3	0
Treatment	6	89	1	11	1	0
Total Cases	15	88	2	11	2	0

**Explanation of Item 21: Educational Needs of the Child**

This is an area of **Strength** for Berkeley DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and address the educational needs of children under agency supervision. This was an area of strength for 88% of the cases. Workers assessed the educational needs of the children during monthly face-to-face visits, and verified the children's educational progress through direct contacts with the schools.

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

The county's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of two items:

22) Physical health of the child **Area Needing Improvement**

23) Mental health of the child **Area Needing Improvement**

**Onsite Review Findings**

**Well Being Item 22: Physical Health of the Child**

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0
Treatment	6	60	4	40	0	0
Total Cases	14	70	6	30	0	0

Berkeley County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
February 2008

**Explanation of Item 22: Physical Health of the Child**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and attend to the physical and dental health needs of children under agency supervision. Overall, 30% of the cases needed improvement for this item. Deficiencies were evident in 40% of the in-home treatment. In some instances, the problem was a failure to assess the needs of children. In other cases, there was no evidence that caseworkers followed up to determine if the identified medical needs were being addressed.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Well Being Item 23: Mental Health of the Child</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	71	2	29	3	0
Treatment	6	67	3	33	3	0
Total Cases	11	69	5	31	4	0

**Explanation of Item 23: Mental Health of the Child**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the mental health needs of children under agency supervision. Sixty-nine percent of the cases reviewed were rated strength for this item. Both foster care and in-home treatment cases showed deficiencies in this area. Reviewers found that some workers struggled to use the agency's assessment and planning form, and sometimes failed to show that an assessment of mental health needs had been done. However, some of the children had identified behavioral and mental health problems, yet were not receiving services to address those problems.

**Unfounded Investigations**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Was the investigation initiated timely?	5	0
Was the assessment adequate?	3	2
Was the decision appropriate?	3	2

**Explanation of Item 24: Unfounded Investigations**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Berkeley DSS. This item evaluates the agency's investigative process and determines if decisions were supported by the facts of the cases. The decision to unfound two investigations was inappropriate because the agency failed to contact other service providers to obtain the information needed to support its decision to unfound the cases.

Berkeley County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
February 2008

Screened Out Intakes
----------------------

	Yes	No	<b>Cannot Determine</b>
Was the Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	10	0	0
			<b>Not Applicable</b>
Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?	1	2	7
Were Appropriate Referrals Made?	2	1	7

**Explanation of Item 25: Screened Out Intakes**

This is an area of **Strength** for Berkeley DSS. This item evaluates the process by which the agency screens out reports of incidents that the agency does not have the legal authority to investigate. All intakes were screened out because they did not allege anything that met the legal definition of abuse or neglect. In some cases the agency’s decision to screen out the report would have been better supported had the agency contacted schools, law enforcement and other collaterals to gather more information before making the decision to screen out intake.

Foster Home Licenses
----------------------

**Explanation of Item 26: Foster Home Licenses**

This is an area of **Strength** for Berkeley DSS. This item evaluates the process by which the agency ensures that all foster homes comply with licensing requirements. A review of licensing records showed many areas of strength, and a few areas needing attention. Documentation in the hard files and in CAPSS was consistent. There were no unlicensed open foster homes.

Berkeley County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
February 2008

<b>Berkeley County DSS Summary Sheet</b>				
<b>Performance Item or Outcome</b>		<b>Performance Item Ratings</b>		
		<b>Strength</b>	<b>Area Needing Improvement</b>	<b>N/A*</b>
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.				
Item 1:	<b>ANI*</b> Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	1/1= 100%		19
Item 2:	<b>Str</b> Repeat maltreatment	19/20= 95%	1/20 = 5%	0
Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.				
Item 3:	<b>ANI</b> Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	9/15 = 60 %	6/15 = 40 %	5
Item 4:	<b>ANI</b> Risk of harm to child(ren)	13/20 = 65%	7/20 = 35%	0
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.				
Item 5:	<b>ANI</b> Foster care re-entries	2/2=100%	0	8
Item 6:	<b>ANI*</b> Stability of foster care placement	9/10 = 90%	1/10=10%	0
Item 7:	<b>ANI</b> Permanency goal for child	6/10 = 60%	4/10 = 40 %	0
Item 8:	<b>ANI</b> Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	1/5 =20%	4/5 = 80 %	5
Item 9:	<b>ANI</b> Adoption	0	4/4 = 100%	6
Item 10:	<b>Str</b> Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	1/1 = 100%	0	9
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.				
Item 11:	<b>Str</b> Proximity of foster care placement	9/9 = 100%	0	1
Item 12:	<b>Str</b> Placement with siblings	5/5 = 100 %	0	5
Item 13:	<b>ANI</b> Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	4/8 = 50 %	4/8=50%	2
Item 14:	<b>ANI</b> Preserving connections	3/6 = 50%	3/6 = 50 %	4
Item 15:	<b>ANI</b> Relative placement	5/9 = 56 %	4/9 = 44 %	1
Item 16:	<b>ANI</b> Relationship of child in care with parents	3/5 = 60 %	2/5 = 40 %	5
Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.				
Item 17:	<b>ANI</b> Needs and services of child, parents, caregiver	11/20 = 55%	9/20 = 45%	0
Item 18:	<b>ANI</b> Child and family involvement in case planning	10/20 = 50%	10/20 = 50%	0
Item 19:	<b>ANI</b> Worker visits with child	13/20 = 65 %	7/20 = 35%	0
Item 20:	<b>ANI</b> Worker visits with parent(s)	5/16 = 31%	11/16= 69 %	4
Item 21:	<b>Str</b> Educational needs of the child	15/17 = 88%	2/17 = 12%	3
Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.				
Item 22:	<b>ANI</b> Physical health of the child	14/20 = 70%	6/20 = 30%	0
Item 23:	<b>ANI</b> Mental health of the child	11/16 = 69%	5/16 = 31 %	4

The objective is that 90% of cases be rated "Strength."

Str = Strength

ANI = Area Needing Improvement

\* = Rating based on