During the week of April 7 to April 11, 2008 a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Greenville County. A sample of open and closed foster care and treatment cases were reviewed. Also reviewed were screened-out intakes and unfounded investigations.

Greenville DSS had its regularly scheduled child welfare services review in September 2007. This is a special review, requested by the county director. The last page of this report compares the Sept 2007 and Apr 2008 reviews. The county improved in 17 of the 23 items reviewed.

Period under Review: February 1, 2007 to March 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 and Foster Home Licensing.

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.

### **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

<b>Agency Data</b>									
Performance Measure 1: Initiating CPS Investigations									
Objective: 100% in <= 24 hours (state law)									
	Number of	Number of	Percent of	Number of					
	Investigations	Investigations	Investigations	Investigations					
		Initiated Timely	Initiated Timely	Above (Below)					
				Objective					
State	18,899	17,906	94.75	(993)					
Greenville	1,649	1,559	94.54	(90)					

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville 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, Greenville County initiated 1,559 of 1,649 (94.54%) investigations of alleged abuse and neglect within 24 hours.

Onsite Review Findings									
Safety Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment									
			Area Needing						
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0			
Treatment	9	90	1	10	0	0			
Total Cases	19	95	1	5	0	0			

#### **Explanation of Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment**

This is an area of **Strength** for Greenville 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. Reviewers found that 95% of the children under agency supervision experienced no additional maltreatment during the period under review. This is a 15% improvement over the September 2007 review.

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** I
- 4) Risk of Harm

Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement

Onsite Review Findings									
Safety Item 3: Services to Family to Protect Children in Home and Prevent Removal.									
	Area Needing								
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	0	0	0	0	10	0			
Treatment	8	80	2 20		0	0			
Total Cases	8	80	2	20	8	0			

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item assesses whether services were adequate to protect children in their home and prevent their removal and placement into foster care. Reviewers found that, in every instance, the decision to remove children from their homes was correct. Eighty percent of the children in treatment cases received the services needed to ensure their safety in the home. This item is an area needing improvement because in 20% of the cases the agency failed to assess the issues associated with all of the other adults

residing in the home with access to the children. Consequently, no services were offered to those persons who occasionally served parental roles in the home.

Onsite Review Findings									
Safety Item 4: Risk of Harm									
			Area No	eeding					
	Stren	Strength		Improvement		licable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0			
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0	0			
Total Cases	17	85	3	15	0	0			

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item assesses whether the agency's intervention reduced risk of harm to children. Reviewers found that risk of harm was reduced in 100% of the foster care cases. However, risk of harm was not adequately managed in 30% of the treatment cases reviewed. The agency did not always intervene appropriately when working with non-compliant drug addicted parents whose behavior continued to pose risks for their children.

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

6) Stability of foster care placement

7) Permanency goal for child

8) Reunification or permanent placement with relatives

9) Adoption

10) Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)

Strength

**Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement** 

Strength

**Area Needing Improvement** 

Strength

### **Agency Data**

**Performance Measure 7: Foster Care Re-entries** – 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	Number of	Percent of Children	Number of				
	Reunified During	Children	Discharged Who	Children				
	Reporting Period	Period Discharged Who Did Not Re-e		Above				
		Did Not Re-enter	Foster Care	(Below)				
		Foster Care		Objective				
State	2,450	2,306	94.12	98.5				
Greenville	153	148	96.73	10.1				

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Greenville 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 re-enter within a year of discharge from care. Agency data indicates that Greenville County DSS exceeded the federal standard with 96.73% of foster children not re-entering care within a year of discharge. The onsite review confirmed that this was a strong area for Greenville County.

<b>Agency</b>	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, what percentage had no more than two placement settings?

Objective: $\geq 86\%$ (federal standard)								
	Foster Care	Number With No	Percent with	Number of				
	Services Open > 7	More than 2	No More than	Children Above				
	days and < 12	Placements	2 Placements	(Below)				
	Months			Objective				
State	4,559	3,616	79.32	(336.7)				
Greenville	430	342	79.53	(30.8)				

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville 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 indicates that the county fell short of this objective by 6.47 percentage points. In other words, 88 of the 430 children served by the foster care program had more than two placements within a year.

Onsite Review Findings									
Permanency Item 7: Permanency Goal for Children									
			Area Needing						
	Strength		Improvement		Not App	licable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0			

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness of permanency goals for children in foster care and the timeliness of those permanency decisions. Reviewers rated 20% of the cases as needing improvement due to delays in the decision to change a child's plan from reunification to TPR/Adoption. In those cases the agency's history with the parents provided sufficient evidence to support a Termination of Parental Rights action.

### **Agency Data**

**Performance Measure 8: Time to Achieve Reunification** – Of all children who were reunited with their parents or caretakers at the time of discharge from foster care, the percentage that were reunited in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal.

1000 miles miles miles 110									
Objective: >= 75.2% (federal standard)									
	Number of Children	Number of	Percent of Children	Number of					
	Returned to	Children Reunited	dren Reunited   Reunited in < 12   Children A						
	Parents/Caretakers	in < 12 Months	Months	(Below)					
				Objective					
State	2,314	1,788	77.27	47.9					
Greenville	205	168	81.95	1.3					

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the activities and processes necessary to accomplish the goal of reunification with caregivers or placement with relatives within 12 months. The federal standard is that 75.2% of children entering foster care be reunited with their parents within 12 months of entering care. Agency data shows that 81.95% of children entering Greenville DSS foster care were reunited within 12 months.

## **Agency Data**

**Measure 9: Length of Time to Finalized Adoption** – 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?

Objective: >= 36.6% (federal standard)								
	Number of	Number of	Percent of	Adoptions Above				
	Adoptions	Adoptions	Adoptions	(Below)				
	Finalized	Finalized < 24	Finalized in < 24	Objective				
		Months	Months					
State	428	7	16.59	(85.6)				
Greenville	40	1:	2 30.0	(2.6)				

### **Explanation of Item 9: Adoption**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville 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 Greenville County is close to meeting the objective with 30% of adoptions being finalized within 24 months. Onsite reviewers saw numerous continued hearings in cases involving children with the plan of Adoption.

Onsite Review Findings								
<b>Permanency Item 10:</b> Permanency Goal of <b>A</b> lternate <b>P</b> lanned <b>P</b> ermanent <b>L</b> iving <b>A</b> rrangement (APPLA)								
			Area Needing					
	Stre	ngth	Improvement		Not Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Foster Care	1	100			9	0		

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

This is area of **Strength** for Greenville 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.

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
12) Placement with siblings in foster care
13) Visiting with parents/siblings in foster care
14) Preserving connections
15) Relative placement
16) Relationship of child in care with parents

Area Needing Improvement

Strength

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 percentage are placed within the county of origin?

**Objective:** > 70% (Agency established objective) Number of Children Number of Percent of Children Number of in Foster Care Children Placed Placed Within Children Above Within County of County of Origin (Below) Objective Origin State 6,790 4,362 64.24 (391.0)Greenville 704 54.83 (106.8)386

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville 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 only 54.83% of Greenville DSS children were placed within the county.

Onsite Review Findings									
Permanency Item 12: Placement with Siblings									
			Area N	Veeding					
	Stren	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	5	83	1	17	4	0			

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep siblings together when it is appropriate to do so. Although most siblings were kept together, the percentage (83%) was not high enough to meet the agency standard (90%) for this item.

Onsite Review Findings						
Permanency Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care						
	Area Needing					
	Stre	ngth	Improv	ement	Not App	olicable
	# % # % # %					
Foster Care	5	63	3	37	2	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to ensure that visits occur between children in foster care with their siblings and parents. In 37% of the foster care cases, reviewers found that children were not visiting their parents at least two times per month.

Onsite Review Findings						
Permanency Item 1	4: Preservin	g Connection	ons			
			Area l	Needing		
	Stren	gth	Impro	vement	Not App	licable
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	100	0	0	5	0

#### **Explanation of Item 14: Preserving Connections**

This is an area of **Strength** for Greenville 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. This was an area of strength for all of the cases reviewed because the agency and its foster parents allowed children in foster care to maintain contact and relationships with relatives and non-relatives who were important to them.

Onsite Review Findings						
Permanency Item	15: Relative	e Placement				
			Area N	leeding		
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	plicable
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	60	4	40	0	0

### **Explanation of Item 15: Relative Placement**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to identify and assess relatives as potential placement resources for children in foster care. Forty percent of the cases needed improvement because relatives of the custodial parent (usually the mother) were assessed, but relatives of the non-custodial parent (usually the father) were not assessed. Those assessments did not occur even when the agency and/or the child were communicating with those relatives.

Onsite Review Findings						
Permanency Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents						
			Area N	leeding		
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	pplicable
	# % # % # %					
Foster Care	2	40	3	60	5	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to promote a strong emotionally supportive relationship between children in care and their parents, beyond the twice-minimum visitation requirement. In 60% of the cases, reviewers found no evidence of the agency's efforts in supporting the parent-child relationships beyond the minimum required twice a month visitation. Agency policy encourages this additional contact when appropriate.

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 six items:

17) Needs and services of child, parents and caregivers

18) Child and family involvement in case planning

19) Worker visits with child

20) Worker visits with parents

Strength

**Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement** 

**Area Needing Improvement** 

Onsite Review Findings							
Well Being Item	Well Being Item 17: Needs and Services of Child, Parents, Foster Parents						
			Area Needing				
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	No	t Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	0	
Treatment	9	90	1 10 0 0				
Total Cases	18	90	2	10	0	0	

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Greenville DSS. This item asks two questions: 1) Were the needs of the children, parents, and foster parents assessed, and 2) Did the agency take steps to meet the identified needs? Reviewers determined that both foster care and treatment cases were strong in this area. The primary caregivers were assessed and referred to appropriate services. The agency's performance for this item improved by 30 percentage points over the September 2007 review.

Onsite Review Findings							
Well Being Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning							
	Area Needing						
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Applicable		
		%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	3	50	3	50	4	0	
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	0	
Total Cases	8	50	8	50	4	0	

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. Onsite reviewers found that in 50% of the treatment cases and 50% of the foster care cases, parents and caretakers were not involved in the case planning process. In the cases needing improvement, the workers would generally dictate what things the parents were required to do, then require the parent to sign the plan presented to them.

Agency Data						
Well Being Ite	ems 14a and 14b: Face	-to-Face Visits wi	th Children (<18	B years of age)		
Objective: 909	% or greater visited every	y month (Agency F	Policy)			
Report Period:	February 1, 2007 - Janu	ary 31, 2008				
	Number of Children	Number of	Percent of	Number of Children		
	Under Agency	Children	Children	Above		
	Supervision at Least	Visited Every	Visited Every	(Below) Objective		
	One Complete	Month	Month	_		
	Calendar Month					
Foster Care	527	474	90	0		
Treatment	2,047	1,021	49.88	(821)		

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville 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 every month. Greenville DSS workers saw 90% of the children in foster care each month, but only 50% of the children in treatment cases.

Onsite Review F	Onsite Review Findings						
Well Being Item 20: Worker Visits with Parent(s)							
		Area Needing					
	Stren	gth	Improv	ement	Not A	pplicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	3	50	3	50	4	0	
Treatment	5	5 50 5 50			0	0	
Total Cases	8	50	8	50	4	0	

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with parents, and evaluates the quality of those visits. To meet the standard for this item, contacts must be made every month. In 50% of the foster care and treatment cases, reviewers found that monthly contacts were not made with the mothers or fathers during the period under review.

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 six items:

21) Educational need of the child

Strength

Onsite Review Findings						
Well Being Item 21: Educational Needs of Child						
		Area Needing				
	Stren	gth	Improv	vement	Not A <sub>1</sub>	oplicable
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	100	0	0	5	0
Treatment	7	88	0			
Total Cases	12	92	1	8	7	0

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and address to the educational needs of children under agency supervision. In 92% of the cases reviewed workers consistently evaluated the children's educational needs and followed up on any problems identified.

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

22) Physical health of the child

**Area Needing Improvement Strength** 

23) Mental health of the child

Onsite Review Findings							
Well Being Item	22: Physic	cal Health of th	e Child				
	S	trength	Impro	vement	Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0	
Treatment	8	80	0	0			
Total Cases	16	80	4	20	0	0	

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and attend to the physical and dental health needs of children under agency supervision. In 80% of the foster care and treatment cases, workers consistently assessed the medical and dental health needs of children. However, in 20% of the foster care cases, there was no documentation to confirm that the children's needs were met. In 20% of the treatment cases, when health needs were identified, there was no documented follow-up with medical providers.

Onsite Review Findings							
Well Being Item 2	Well Being Item 23: Mental Health of the Child						
		Area Needing					
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not	t Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	5	83	1	17	5	0	
Treatment	7	100	0	0	3	0	
Total Cases	12	92	1	8	8	0	

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and attend to the mental health needs of children under agency supervision. Mental health evaluations were conducted on 83% of the children in foster care. Agency policy requires that all children in foster care receive at least an initial mental health evaluation. In-home treatment workers consistently assessed the mental health needs of the children in their care.

### **Unfounded Investigations**

	Yes	No
Investigation initiated timely?	10	0
Was assessment adequate?	7	3
Was decision appropriate?	10	0

### **Explanation of Item 24: Unfounded Investigations**

This is an area of **Strength** for Greenville DSS. This item evaluates the agency's investigative process and determines if decisions were supported by the facts of the cases. All decisions to unfound investigation of abuse and neglect were appropriate. The evidence collected showed that none of those cases met the legal definition of abuse or neglect. However, in 30% of the cases investigators found significant problems affecting the well being of the children within those families. Rather than making needed referrals, the cases were closed.

### Screened Out Intakes

	Yes	No	Cannot Determine
Was Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	10	0	0
	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?	0	0	10
Were Appropriate Referrals Made?	1	1	8

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Greenville 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. In every case, reviewers determined that Greenville County appropriately screened out the report.

Greenville County DSS Summary Sheet								
			Performance Item Ratings					
Performance Item or Outcome		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	7/7 = 100%	0	13			
Item 2:	Str	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:	ANI	Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	8/10 = 80%	2/10 = 20%	10			
Item 4:	ANI	Risk of harm to child(ren)	17/20 = 85%	3/20 = 15%	0			
	Pe	ermanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency	and stability in th	eir living situations.				
Item 5:	Str	Foster care re-entries	2/2 = 100%	0	8			
Item 6:	*ANI	Stability of foster care placement	10/10 = 100%	0	0			
Item 7:	ANI	Permanency goal for child	8/10 = 80%	2/10 = 20%	0			
Item 8:	Str	Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	1/3 = 33%	2/3 = 67%	7			
Item 9:	ANI	Adoption	0	6/6 = 100%	4			
Item 10:	Str	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:	ANI	Proximity of foster care placement	7/9 = 78%	2/9 = 22%	1			
Item 12:	ANI	Placement with siblings	5/6 = 83%	1/6 = 17%	4			
Item 13:	ANI	Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	5/8 = 63%	3/8 = 37%	2			
Item 14:	Str	Preserving connections	5/5 = 100%	0	5			
Item 15:	ANI	Relative placement	6/10 = 60%	4/10 = 40%	0			
Item 16:	ANI	Relationship of child in care with parents	2/5 = 40%	3/5 = 60%	5			
	Wel	l Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capac	ity 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	8/16 = 50%	8/16 = 50%	4			
Item 19:	ANI	Worker visits with child	13/20 = 65%	7/20 = 35%	0			
Item 20:	ANI	Worker visits with parent(s)	7/16 = 44%	9/16 = 56%	4			
	Wel	l Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate s	ervices to meet th	eir educational needs.				
Item 21:	Str	Educational needs of the child	12/13 = 92%	1/13 = 8%	7			
Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.								
Item 22:	ANI	Physical health of the child	16/20 = 80%	4/20 = 20%	0			
Item 23:	Str	Mental health of the child	11/12 = 92%	1/12 = 8%	8			

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

Str = Area of Strength

ANI = Area Needing Improvement

<sup>\* =</sup> Rating based on outcome report, not onsite review findings

Greenville DSS Performance Rating Change								
Performance Item or Outcome		Performance Item Ratings						
		Strength Sept 2007	Strength Apr 2008	Change				
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.								
Item 1:	Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	4/8 = 50%	7/7 = 100%	+ 50%				
Item 2:	Repeat maltreatment	16/20 = 80%	19/20 = 95%	+ 15%				
	Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in th	eir homes whenever	possible and appropri	ate.				
Item 3:	Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	6/12 = 50%	8/10 = 80%	+ 30%				
Item 4:	Risk of harm to child(ren)	12/20 = 60%	17/20 = 85%	+ 25%				
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.								
Item 5:	Foster care re-entries	2/2 = 100%	2/2 = 100%	No Change				
Item 6:	Stability of foster care placement	9/10 = 90%	10/10 = 100%	+ 10%				
Item 7:	Permanency goal for child	7/10 = 70%	8/10 = 80%	+ 10%				
Item 8:	Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	0%	1/3 = 33%	+ 33%				
Item 9:	Adoption	2/8 = 25%	0%	- 25%				
Item 10:	Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	1/1 = 100%	1/1 = 100%	No Change				
]	Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relation	•	•	ldren.				
Item 11:	Proximity of foster care placement	7/7 = 100%	7/9 = 78%	- 22%				
Item 12:	Placement with siblings	7/9 = 78%	5/6 = 83%	+ 5%				
Item 13:	Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	3/8 = 38%	5/8 = 63%	+ 25%				
Item 14:	Preserving connections	1/7 = 14%	5/5 = 100%	+ 86%				
Item 15:	Relative placement	5/7 = 71%	6/10 = 60%	- 11%				
Item 16:	Relationship of child in care with parents	0%	2/5 = 40%	+ 40%				
-	Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced cap	pacity to provide for	their children's needs					
Item 17:	Needs and services of child, parents, caregiver	12/20 = 60%	18/20 = 90%	+ 30%				
Item 18:	Child and family involvement in case planning	6/17 = 35%	8/16 = 50%	+ 15%				
Item 19:	Worker visits with child	13/20 = 65%	13/20 = 65%	No Change				
Item 20:	Worker visits with parent(s)	3/12 = 25%	7/16 = 44%	+ 19%				
	Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropria	te services to meet th	neir educational needs.	<u> </u>				
Item 21:	Educational needs of the child	10/15 = 67%	12/13 = 92%	+ 25%				
Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.								
Item 22:	Physical health of the child	8/20 = 40%	16/20 = 80%	+ 40%				
Item 23:	Mental health of the child	10/16 = 63%	11/12 = 92%	+ 29%				