

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2008

During the week of June 23 - 27, 2008, a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Clarendon 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, Clarendon DSS supervisors, representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

Period under Review: June 1, 2007 to May 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. 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.

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 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 | Area Needing Improvement |
| 2) Repeat Maltreatment | Strength |

Agency Data				
Performance Measure 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations on Reports of Child Maltreatment				
Objective: 100% in <= 24 hours (state law)				
	Number of Determinations	Number of Investigations Initiated Timely	Percent of Investigations Initiated Timely	Numbers of Investigations Above (Below) Objective
State	18,774	17,966	95.70%	(808)
Clarendon	243	231	95.06%	(12)

Explanation of Item 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Clarendon 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, Clarendon County initiated 231 of its 243 investigations (95%) of alleged abuse and neglect within 24 hours. Reviewers determined that the agency was appropriately assigning risk ratings to investigations.

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2008

Agency Data				
Item 2: 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? Report Period: 05/1/06 to 04/30/07				
Objective: \geq Agency Average				
	Number of Treatment Cases Closed	Number of Treatment Cases with no founded intake w/in 12 months	Percent of Treatment Cases that did not have a new founded intake w/in 12 months	Number of Cases Above (Below) State Average
State	5,165	4,530	87.71%	
Clarendon	61	55	90.16%	1.5

Onsite Review Findings						
Safety Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	0
Treatment	9	90	1	20	0	0
Total Cases	18	90	2	10	0	0

Explanation of Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment

This is an area of **Strength** for Clarendon DSS. This item measures the occurrence of maltreatment among children under agency supervision. Reviewers found that 90% of the children under agency supervision did not experience additional maltreatment. Those findings were supported by agency data.

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 | Strength |
| 4) Risk of Harm | Strength |

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2008

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Safety Item 3: Services to Family to Protect Children in Home and Prevent Removal.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	80	1	20	5	0
Treatment	10	100	0	0	0	0
Total Cases	14	93	1	7	5	0

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Clarendon DSS. This item assesses whether services were adequate to protect children in their home and prevent their removal and placement into foster care. In 80% of the foster care cases, reviewers determined that the decision to remove the children from their homes and place them in foster care was appropriate. The families in every treatment case (100%) reviewed were being offered the types of services needed to safely maintain the children in their home.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Safety Item 4: Risk of Harm						
	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	20	0	0

Explanation of Item 4: Risk of Harm

This is an area of **Strength** for Clarendon DSS. This item assesses whether the agency's intervention reduced risks of harm to children. In 90% of the cases reviewed, risk of harm was adequately managed. Although the county met the compliance standard for this item 20% of the in-home treatment cases needed improvement because the agency failed to assess risks posed by other adult household members and live-in paramours.

Clarendon County DSS
 Child Welfare Services Review
 June 2008

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

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

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

Onsite Review Findings

Permanency Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	100	0	0	8	0

Explanation of Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries

This is area of **Strength** for Clarendon 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 at least 90.1% of children entering foster care not be re-entries within a year of discharge from care. Reviewers determined that none of the children in foster care during the period under review had been discharged from foster care.

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2008

Agency Data				
Performance Measure 6: Stability of Foster Care Placements – 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, the percentage that had no more than two placement settings.				
Objective: >= 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 Above (Below) Objective
State	4,105	3,062	74.59%	(250.7)
Clarendon	36	26	72.22%	(3.1)

Explanation of Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Clarendon DSS. This item measures the frequency of placement changes for children in foster care, and assesses the reasons for those changes. The objective for this item is that at least 86% of the children have no more than two placements within a year. For Clarendon DSS the percentage with no more than two placements was 72.22%.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	0

Explanation of Item 7: Permanency Goal for Children

This is an area of **Strength** for Clarendon DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness of permanency goals for children in foster care and the timeliness of those permanency decisions. Reviewers found that in 90% of the cases, the agency identified the appropriate goal timely.

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2008

Agency Data				
Performance Measure 8: Time to Achieve Reunification – Of all children who were reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of discharge from foster care and had been in care for 8 days or more, what percentage were reunified in less than 12 months from the date of their latest removal from home?				
Objective: >= 75.2% (federal standard)				
	Number of Children Returned to Parents/Caretakers	Number of Children Returned to Parents/Caretakers after in Care < 12 months	Percent of Children Returned to Parents/Caretakers after in Care < 12 months	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	2,475	1,906	77.01%	44.8
Clarendon	38	21	55.26%	(7.6)

Onsite Review Findings						
Permanency Item 8: Reunification						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	50	2	50	6	0

Explanation of Item 8: Reunification or Permanent Placement with Relatives

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Clarendon DSS. This item evaluates the activities and processes necessary to accomplish the goal of reunification with caregivers or placement with relatives. The onsite review found that 50% of the cases needed improvement because the services geared toward reunification were not effective. In one case, the mother’s history of non-compliance while her child was in foster care and in a prior treatment case should have caused the plan to change from Return Home to TPR/Adoption. In a second case, the child had been in care over a year without a merit hearing because the last merit hearing held ended in a mistrial. Agency data shows that the county did meet the federal standard for percentage of children who return home within a year of entering care.

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2008

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 9: Length of Time to Achieve Adoption						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	33	2	67	7	0

Explanation of Item 9: Adoption

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Clarendon DSS. This item evaluates the process within the child welfare system to achieve timely adoptions for children in foster care.

Reviewers found that 67% of foster children with the plan of adoption had already been in care more than 24 months. Agency data shows that only three of the 17 children with the plan of adoption had completed TPRs. Legal delays resulted from disagreements among DSS staff, GAL and the court.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 10: Permanency Goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	67	1	33	7	0

Explanation of Item 10: Permanency Goal of APPLA

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Clarendon DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness and effectiveness of services provided to children with the permanency plan of APPLA. Reviewers also rate whether the agency attempted to locate and reassess relatives or non-relatives that were willing to commit to the youth's long-term care every six months. One case was rated as an area needing improvement because there were relatives known to the agency, but there was no evidence that those relatives were ever assessed to determine their long-term commitment to care for the youth.

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 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 | Strength |
| 12) Placement with siblings in foster care | Strength |
| 13) Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care | Strength |
| 14) Preserving connections | Strength |
| 15) Relative placement | Area Needing Improvement |
| 16) Relationship of child in care with parents | Area Needing Improvement |

Agency Data

Performance Measure 13: Foster Children Placed Within County of Origin – Of all children in foster care during the reporting period (excluding MTS and Adoptions children), what the percent placed within their county of origin.

Objective: >=70% (Agency Standard)

	Number of Children in Care 06/06/07 – 06/05/08	Number of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Percent of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	6,507	4,346	66.79%	(208.9)
Clarendon	80	60	75.00%	4.0

Explanation of Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement

This is an area of **Strength** for Clarendon 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 that at least 70% of the children in care be placed within the county. Agency data shows that 75% of Clarendon DSS children were placed within the county.

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2008

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 12: Placement with Siblings						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	100	0	0	6	0

Explanation of Item 12: Placement with Siblings in Foster Care

This is an area of **Strength** for Clarendon DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep siblings together when it is appropriate to do so. In every case, the agency kept siblings together when it was appropriate to do so.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	88	1	12	2	0

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

This is an area of **Strength** Clarendon DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to ensure that visits occur between children in foster care with their siblings and parents. This was an area of strength in 88% of the cases reviewed. The agency made concerted efforts to maintain the relationships of children in care with their parents and siblings. All parents were included in visitation plans. However, the agency did not consistently document why some visits did not occur.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 14: Preserving Connections						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	9	100	0	0	1	0

Explanation of Item 14: Preserving Connections

This is an area of **Strength** for Clarendon DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to preserve children's connections to the people, places and things that are important to them. In 100% of the cases reviewed, the agency did a very good job of preserving the relationships that were important to children in foster care. Reviewers saw many examples of extended relatives to include uncles, aunts and cousins involved in the children's lives.

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2008

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 15: Relative Placement						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	70	3	30	0	0

Explanation of Item 15: Relative Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Clarendon DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to identify and assess relatives as potential placement resources for children in foster care. Seventy percent of the cases reviewed were rated strong in this area. Reviewers found that the agency did not consistently assess paternal relatives as placement options.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Permanency Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	80	1	20	5	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Clarendon 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 80% of the cases reviewed, reviewers found increased parental involvement when the needs of children clearly called for it. This was evident in most, but not all cases involving preschool aged children, children who were to return home within six months and teenagers who requested additional contact with their parents.

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 | Strength |
| 18) Child and family involvement in case planning | Area Needing Improvement |
| 19) Worker visits with child | Area Needing Improvement |
| 20) Worker visits with parents | Area Needing Improvement |

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2008

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 17: Needs and Services of Child, Parents, Foster Parents						
	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	20	0	0

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Clarendon DSS. This item asks two questions: 1) Were the needs of the child, parents, and caregivers assessed, and 2) Did the agency take steps to meet the identified needs? Although there were deficiencies noted in 20% of the treatment cases, the county's overall performance met agency standards for this item. The treatment cases needing attention had significant delays before the agency addressed the needs of the parents.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	87	1	13	2	0
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0	0
Total Cases	14	78	4	22	2	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Clarendon DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. Onsite reviewers found that in 30% of the treatment cases and in 13% of the foster care cases, parents, foster parents and caretakers were not involved in the case planning process. In three of the 10 treatment cases, there was no evidence of the agency's efforts to engage the fathers and age appropriate children in the case planning process.

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2008

Agency Data				
Performance Measure 14: Face-to-Face Visits With Children				
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	Number of Children Above or (Below) Standard
Foster Care	66	61	92.42%	(5)
Treatment	250	166	66.40%	(25)

Explanation of Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Clarendon DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with children under agency supervision, and evaluates the quality of those visits. State law and agency policy requires that children under agency supervision be seen each month. Agency data shows that the agency fell short of the 100% compliance standard in both foster care and treatment cases. In 30% of the treatment cases, reviewers found that the majority of worker contacts with children were in the DSS office and at the schools, rather than in the children's place of residence.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 20: Worker Visits with Parent(s)						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	80	1	20	5	0
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	0
Total Cases	9	60	6	40	5	0

Explanation of Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Clarendon DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with parents, and evaluates the quality of those visits. Although this was a relatively strong area in foster care cases, 50% of the treatment cases needed improvement. The agency failed to acknowledge the loco parentis status of live in paramours.

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 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	7	100	0	0	3	0
Treatment	9	100	0	0	1	0
Total Cases	16	100	0	0	4	0

Explanation of Item 21: Educational Needs of the Child

This is an area of **Strength** for Clarendon 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 100% of the cases reviewed. Reviewers found that workers made direct contact with guidance counselors and teachers and there were copies of grade reports and attendance records in both foster care and treatment cases.

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 **Strength**
23) Mental health of the child **Strength**

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2008

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 22: 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
Total Cases	20	100	0	0	0	0

Explanation of Item 22: Physical Health of the Child

This is an area of **Strength** for Clarendon DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and attend to the medical needs of children under agency supervision. This was an area of strength for 100% of the cases reviewed in both treatment and foster care cases. Copies of medical, dental and immunizations records were in all the cases to include BabyNet referrals completed on age appropriate children.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u>						
Well Being Item 23: Mental Health of the Child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	100	0	0	3	0
Treatment	8	89	1	11	1	0
Total Cases	15	94	1	6	4	0

Explanation of Item 23: Mental Health of the Child

This is an area of **Strength** for Clarendon DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the mental health needs of children under agency supervision. In 94% of the cases reviewed, the children's mental health needs were assessed and addressed.

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2008

Unfounded Investigations

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

Explanation of Item 24: Unfounded Investigations

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Clarendon DSS. This item evaluates the agency's investigative process and determines if decisions were supported by the facts of the cases. All investigations with the exception of one were initiated timely. In that investigation, the initial contact was missed by 15 minutes. The assessment was not adequate in one of the five cases reviewed because the investigators did not interview the grandparents who were responsible for the child to gather the information needed to support the decision to unfound the case.

Screened Out Intakes

	Yes	No	Cannot Determine
Was Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	9	1	0
	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?	8	1	1
Were Appropriate Referrals Made?	5	1	4

Explanation of Item 25: Screened Out Intakes

This is an area of **Strength** for Clarendon DSS. This item evaluates the process by which the agency screens out reports of incidents of abuse and/or neglect to determine if the intakes were appropriately screened out. Ninety percent of the reports were appropriately screened out because they did not allege anything that met the legal definition of abuse or neglect. One of the 10 intakes screened out should have been accepted for investigation.

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2008

Foster Home Licenses

Explanation of Item 26: Foster Home Licenses

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Clarendon DSS. This item evaluates the process by which the agency ensures that all foster homes comply with licensing requirements. There were three foster home licenses that were not valid. Deficiencies included licenses issued without the required fire inspections, sexual offender and criminal record checks.

Clarendon County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
June 2008

Clarendon County DSS Summary Sheet				
Performance Item or Outcome		Performance Item Ratings		
		Strength	Area Needing Improvement	N/A*
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.				
Item 1:	*ANI Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	8/8=100%	0	12
Item 2:	Str Repeat maltreatment	18/20=90%	2/20=10%	0
Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.				
Item 3:	Str Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	14/15=93%	1/15=7%	5
Item 4:	Str Risk of harm to child(ren)	18/20=90%	2/20=10%	0
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.				
Item 5:	Str Foster care re-entries	2/2=100%	0	8
Item 6:	*ANI Stability of foster care placement	9/10=90%	1/10=10%	0
Item 7:	Str Permanency goal for child	9/10=90%	1/10=10%	0
Item 8:	ANI Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	2/4 = 50%	2/4 = 50%	6
Item 9:	ANI Adoption	1/3=33%	2/3=67%	7
Item 10:	ANI Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	2/3=67%	1/3=33%	7
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.				
Item 11:	Str Proximity of foster care placement	9/10= 90%	1/10=10%	0
Item 12:	Str Placement with siblings	4/4=100%	0	6
Item 13:	Str Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	7/8=88%	1/8=12%	2
Item 14:	Str Preserving connections	9/9=100%	0	1
Item 15:	ANI Relative placement	7/10= 70%	3/10=30%	0
Item 16:	ANI Relationship of child in care with parents	4/5=80%	1/5=20%	5
Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.				
Item 17:	Str Needs and services of child, parents, caregiver	18/20=90%	2/20=10%	0
Item 18:	ANI Child and family involvement in case planning	14/18=78%	4/18=22%	2
Item 19:	ANI Worker visits with child	17/20=85%	3/20=15%	0
Item 20:	ANI Worker visits with parent(s)	9/15=60%	6/15=40%	5
Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.				
Item 21:	Str Educational needs of the child	16/16=100%	0	4
Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.				
Item 22:	Str Physical health of the child	20/20=100%	0	0
Item 23:	Str Mental health of the child	15/16=94%	1/16=6%	4

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

Str = Strength

ANI = Area Needing Improvement

* = Rating based on agency data, not onsite review findings