

South Carolina Department of Social Services
Child Welfare Quality Assurance Review: Horry County
Summary Report

This summary report describes the results of the South Carolina Department of Social Services (DSS) Horry County Quality Assurance Review, conducted April 7 – 11, 2014. The period under review was October 1, 2013 to March 31, 2014.

DSS Child Welfare Quality Assurance Reviews are conducted using the *Onsite Review Instrument* (OSRI) finalized by the federal Administration for Children & Families (ACF) in July 2008. This instrument is used to review foster care and family preservation services cases. Thirty cases were reviewed including 15 foster care and 15 family preservation cases.

The OSRI is divided into three sections: safety, permanency, and child and family well-being. There are two safety outcomes, two permanency outcomes, and three well-being outcomes. Reviewers collect information on a number of *items* related to each of the outcomes through case file review, the use of the Child and Adult Protective Services System (CAPSS), and case related interviews. CAPSS is South Carolina’s SACWIS, which contains all case related information. This information is detailed on the OSRI as support for rating selection.

The ratings for each *item* are combined to determine the rating for the outcome. The *items* are rated as *strength*, *area needing improvement*, or not applicable. Outcomes are rated as being substantially achieved, partially achieved, not achieved, or not applicable. Ratings for each of the outcomes are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. Child Welfare QA Onsite Reviews – Ratings by Outcome

Outcome	Substantially Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
Safety 1 <i>Children Are, First and Foremost, Protected from Abuse and Neglect</i>	80% (4)	20% (1)	0% (0)
Safety 2 <i>Children are Safely Maintained in their Homes whenever Possible and Appropriate</i>	40% (12)	10% (3)	50% (15)
Permanency 1 <i>Children have Permanency and Stability in their Living Situations</i>	27% (4)	67% (10)	6% (1)
Permanency 2 <i>The Continuity of Family Relationships and Connections is Preserved for Children</i>	27% (4)	73% (11)	0% (0)
Well-Being 1 <i>Families have Enhanced Capacity to Provide for their Children’s Needs</i>	17% (5)	50% (15)	33% (10)
Well-Being 2 <i>Children receive Appropriate Services to meet their Educational Needs</i>	80% (12)	7% (1)	13% (2)
Well-Being 3 <i>Children receive Adequate Services to meet their Physical and Mental Health Needs</i>	40% (10)	28% (7)	32% (8)

Results for outcomes and *items* are reported by the number of cases and the percentage of total cases given each rating. In addition, the percentage of *strengths* is calculated for each *item*. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *areas needing improvement*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the *percentage of strengths*. Appendix 1 provides a more detailed analysis of issues impacting the ANI ratings.

SECTION I: REVIEW FINDINGS

Safety Outcome 1: Children Are, First and Foremost, Protected from Abuse and Neglect

Two *items* are included under Safety Outcome 1. Ratings for the two *items* are shown in Table 2.

Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether responses to all accepted child maltreatment reports received during the period under review were initiated and face-to-face contact with the child made, within the timeframes established by agency policies or State statute.

Table 2.

Rating	Item 1	Item 2
<i>Strength</i>	13% (4)	17% (5)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	3% (1)	0% (0)
<i>Not Applicable</i>	84% (25)	83% (25)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	80% (4)	100% (5)

Item 2: Repeat maltreatment

Purpose of Assessment: To determine if any child in the family experienced repeat maltreatment within a 6-month period.

Safety Outcome 2: Children are Safely Maintained in Their Homes Whenever Possible and Appropriate

Two *items* are included under Safety Outcome 2. Ratings for the *items* are shown in Table 3.

Item 3: Services to family

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to provide services to the family to prevent children’s entry into foster care or re-entry after a reunification.

Table 3.

Rating	Item 3	Item 4
<i>Strength</i>	23% (7)	40% (12)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	44% (13)	60% (18)
<i>Not Applicable</i>	33% (10)	0% (0)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	35% (7)	40% (12)

Item 4: Risk assessment and safety management

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess and address the risk and safety concerns relating to the child(ren) in their own homes or while in foster care.

Permanency Outcome 1: Children Have Permanency and Stability in Their Living Situations

Six *items* are included under Permanency Outcome 1. Ratings for the *items* are shown in Table 4.

Item 5: Foster Care reentries

Purpose of Assessment: To assess whether children who entered foster care during the period under review were re-entering within 12 months of a prior foster care episode.

Item 6: Stability of foster care placement

Purpose of Assessment: To determine if the child in foster care is in a stable placement at the time of the onsite review and that any changes in placement that occurred during the period under review were in the best interest of the child and consistent with achieving the child’s permanency goal(s).

Item 7: Permanency goal for child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether appropriate permanency goals were established for the child in a timely manner.

Item 8: Reunification, guardianship or permanent placement with relatives

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether concerted efforts were made, or are being made, during the period under review, to achieve reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives in a timely manner.

Item 9: Adoption

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made, or are being made, to achieve a finalized adoption in a timely manner.

Item 10: Other planned permanent living arrangement (OPPLA)

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure:

- That the child is adequately prepared to make the transition from foster care to independent living (if it is expected that the child will remain in foster care until he or she reaches the age of majority or is emancipated).
- That the child, even though remaining in foster care, is in a “permanent” living arrangement with a foster parent or relative caregiver and that there is a commitment on the part of all parties involved that the child remain in that placement until he or she reaches the age of majority or is emancipated.
- That the child is in a long-term care facility and will remain in that facility until transition to an adult care facility.

Table 4.

Rating	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9	Item 10
Strength	10% (3)	37% (11)	23% (7)	23% (7)	0% (0)	7% (2)
Area needing improvement	3% (1)	13% (4)	27% (8)	17% (5)	10% (3)	0% (0)
Not Applicable	87% (26)	50% (15)	50% (15)	60% (18)	90% (27)	93% (28)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)
% Strengths	75% (3)	73.3% (11)	46.7% (7)	58.3% (7)	0% (0)	100% (2)

Permanency Outcome 2: The Continuity of Family Relationships and Connections is Preserved for Children

Six items are included under Permanency Outcome 2. Ratings for the items are shown in Table 5.

Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that the child’s foster care placement was close enough to the parent(s) to facilitate face-to-face contact between the child and the parent(s) while the child was in foster care.

Item 12: Placement with siblings

Purpose of Assessment: To determine if, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that siblings in foster care are placed together unless a separation was necessary to meet the needs of one of the siblings.

Item 13: Visiting with parents & siblings in foster care

Purpose of Assessment: To determine if, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that visitation between a child in foster care and his or her mother, father, and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child’s relationship with these close family members.

Item 14: Preserving connections

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to maintain the child’s connections to his or her neighborhood, community, faith, extended family, tribe, school, and friends.

Item 15: Relative placement

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to place the child with relatives when appropriate.

Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in foster care and his or her mother and father or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

Table 5.

Rating	Item 11	Item 12	Item 13	Item 14	Item 15	Item 16
Strength	37% (11)	30% (9)	10% (3)	37% (11)	37% (11)	20% (6)
Area needing improvement	10% (3)	7% (2)	40% (12)	13% (4)	13% (4)	30% (9)
Not Applicable	53% (16)	63% (19)	50% (15)	50% (15)	50% (15)	50% (15)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)
% Strengths	78.6% (11)	81.8% (9)	20% (3)	73.3% (11)	73.3% (11)	40% (6)

Well-Being Outcome 1: Families Have Enhanced Capacity to Provide for Their Children’s Needs

Four items are included under Well-Being Outcome 1. Ratings for the items are shown in Table 6.

Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, & foster parents

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess the needs of children, parents, and foster parents (both at the child’s entry into foster care [if the child entered during the period under review] or on an ongoing basis) to identify the services necessary to achieve case goals and adequately address the issues relevant to the agency’s involvement with the family, and provided the appropriate services.

Item 18: Child & family involvement in case planning

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made (or are being made) to involve parents and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

Item 19: Caseworker visits with the child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the child(ren) in the case are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child and promote achievement of case goals.

Item 20: Caseworker visits with parents

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the mothers and fathers of the children are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the children and promote achievement of case goals.

Table 6.

Rating	Item 17	Item 18	Item 19	Item 20
<i>Strength</i>	20% (6)	27% (8)	60% (18)	20% (6)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	80% (24)	73% (22)	40% (12)	77% (23)
Not Applicable	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (1)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	20% (6)	26.7% (8)	60% (18)	20.7% (6)

Well-Being Outcome 2: Children Receive Appropriate Services to Meet Their Educational Needs

One *item* is included under Well-Being Outcome 2. Ratings for the *item* are shown in Table 7.

Item 21: Educational needs of child

Purpose of Assessment: To assess whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess children’s educational needs at the initial contact with the child (if the case was opened during the period under review) or on an ongoing basis (if the case was opened before the period under review), and whether identified needs were appropriately addressed in case planning and case management activities.

Table 7.

Rating	Item 21
<i>Strength</i>	40% (12)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	10% (3)
Not Applicable	50% (15)
Total	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	80% (12)

Well-Being Outcome 3: Children Receive Adequate Services to Meet Their Physical and Mental Health Needs

Two *items* are included under Well-Being Outcome 3. Ratings for the *items* are shown in Table 8.

Item 22: Physical health of child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the physical health needs of the child, including dental health needs.

Item 23: Mental/behavioral health of child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the child(ren).

Table 8.

Rating	Item 22	Item 23
<i>Strength</i>	30% (9)	43% (13)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	43% (13)	17% (5)
Not Applicable	27% (8)	40% (12)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	40.9% (9)	72.2% (13)

Table 9. Horry County *Percent of Strengths* on 23 Quality Assurance Items Across Two Reviews

Item	October 2013 (PUR 10-1-12 to 9-30-13)	April 2014 (PUR 10-1-13 to 3-31-14)
1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations	81.8%	80.0%
2. Reoccurrence of Maltreatment	100.0%	100.0%
3. Services to Family	60.0%	35.0%
4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	50.0%	40.0%
5. Foster Care Re-Entries	100.0%	75.0%
6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	66.7%	73.3%
7. Permanency Goal for Child	40.0%	46.7%
8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Perm. Placement with Relatives	44.4%	58.3%
9. Adoption	14.3%	0.0%
10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	75.0%	100.0%
11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	100.0%	78.6%
12. Placement with Siblings	100.0%	81.8%
13. Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	46.2%	20.0%
14. Preserving Connections	66.7%	73.3%
15. Relative Placement	50.0%	73.3%
16. Relationship of Child in Care with Parent	30.8%	40.0%
17. Needs and Services for Child, Parents, and Caregivers	23.3%	20.0%
18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	33.3%	26.7%
19. Worker Visits with Child	60.0%	60.0%
20. Worker Visits with Parents	14.8%	20.7%
21. Educational Needs of the Child	86.7%	80.0%
22. Physical Health of the Child	59.1%	40.9%
23. Mental Health of the Child	64.7%	72.2%

SECTION II: FOSTER HOME LICENSE REVIEW

As part of the Quality Assurance Review Process in Horry County, ten Foster Home Licenses were randomly selected from the list of all licenses issued for the county during the period under review. These licenses are reviewed using the *South Carolina Department of Social Services Quality Assurance Foster Home License Review Instruments*. There is one instrument for issuance of initial licenses and another instrument for the renewal of licenses. Each instrument contains a section of deficiencies, namely agency oversight, data entry, and qualitative issues. Deficiencies noted in this section may not invalidate the license but still require attention and correction by county management. Each instrument includes the appropriate agency, state, and federal requirements.

Initial License review criteria include the following *items*:

- Applications
- Autobiography information
- Financial information
- Child factor's checklists
- Initial home assessment studies
- References
- Information related to firearms and ammunition in the house
- Pet vaccination information
- Background checks
- Convictions
- Required trainings
- Medical reports
- Fire inspections/re-inspections
- Disaster Preparedness Plans
- DHEC/Lead inspections
- Alternative caregiver forms
- Central registry check on alternative caregiver, if applicable
- A review of any conflicts noted between file documents and CAPSS
- Completion and issuance of the 1513 prior to the license being issued
- Guidelines regarding in-ground swimming pools

Renewal License review criteria include the following *items*:

- Convictions
- Training hours
- Medical reports if a new household member has been added or if there is a change in foster parent's medical status
- Updated home studies
- Fire inspections and drills
- Quarterly home visits
- Disaster Preparedness Plans
- FBI checks, if applicable
- Guidelines regarding in-ground swimming pools
- 1513 completed prior to issuance of the license
- Any amendments to the license, if applicable
- Documentation regarding if there are more than five children in the home
- Annual firearms location update
- Information concerning the alternative caregivers
- Safety checks of alternative caregivers
- A review of child protective service allegations
- Pet vaccination information
- A review of any regulatory infractions
- A review of any conflicts noted between file documents and CAPSS

Possible *deficiencies* found in Initial and Renewal cases include:

- Updated home studies
- Discipline Agreements
- Fire drills
- Quarterly home visits
- Disaster Preparedness Plans

- Information concerning the alternative caregivers
- Alternative caregiver forms
- Applications
- Autobiography information
- Financial information
- Child factor’s checklists
- Initial home assessment studies
- References

Areas noted as having occurred as required on the assessment are rated as *strengths*. Those *items* that were not met are rated as an *area needing improvement (ANI)*. If the issue is not applicable, it is rated N/A.

Additionally, the percentage of *strengths* is also calculated for each *item*. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Results of the review are noted in Table 10.

Foster Home Licensing Findings for Horry County

Initial License Cases. Two foster care issuances for initial/standard license were reviewed. Information for the ratings was obtained by reviewing the case file and from CAPSS. One of the cases reviewed was rated an *ANI* because all of the licensing requirements were not met prior to authorization of the license renewal. The issue identified that led to the rating of *ANI* for the one case include:

Firearms:

- Documentation was unclear regarding whether or not ammunition was stored separately from firearms.

Table 10. Summary of Ratings for Initial and Renewal Cases.

Rating	Initial	Renewal
<i>Strength</i>	1 (50%)	2 (20%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	1 (50%)	6 (60%)
Total	2 (100%)	8 (100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	1 (50%)	2 (25%)

Renewal License Cases. Six of the eight cases reviewed were rated as *ANI* because all of the licensing requirements were not met prior to authorization of the license renewal. Information for the ratings was obtained by reviewing the case file and from CAPSS. Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* for the six cases include:

Background Checks:

- There was not documentation in the case file to support that central registry, SLED, sex offender registry, and/or FBI checks for all applicable individuals were completed in a timely manner, or were completed at all.

Training:

- The required 28 hours of training were not completed according to documentation.

Pet Vaccination Records:

- Documentation confirming that pet vaccinations were up-to-date was not located in the case file.

Deficiencies found in Initial and Renewal Cases. Deficiencies were noted in all ten files reviewed. Issues identified by the reviewers include:

Initial Case Deficiencies

Safety:

- All Discipline Agreements were not located in the case file.

Renewal Case Deficiencies

Alternative Caregivers:

- Documentation did not include identification of an alternative caregiver/ babysitter.

Fire Drills:

- Documentation verifying that fire drills were conducted within 24 hours of a child's placement was not located in the case file.
- Documentation verifying that quarterly fire drills were conducted while children were placed in foster homes was not located in the case file.

Safety:

- All Discipline Agreements were not located in the case file or were not signed.
- Documentation did not provide verification that quarterly home visits were completed in a timely manner.
- All Disaster Preparedness Plans were not located in the case file.

SECTION III: CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICE NO ACTION REPORTS REVIEW

A review of ten no action reports was completed to determine whether agency policy and procedures were followed. The reports were randomly selected from the list of reports on which no action was taken by the county during the period under review. The *South Carolina Department of Social Services Quality Assurance Review No Action Reports Instrument* was used to conduct the review. This instrument includes a description of the allegation and fourteen questions regarding the no action decisions and processes (see Table 11).

Table 11. Summary of Item Ratings for No Action Reports Review

	Yes	No	NA	Total
1. Illegal substance use alleged AND reason for safety threatened with harm	1	9	0	10
2. Use of CAPSS and/or other systems for prior involvement	6	4	0	10
3a. Maltreatment tab in CAPSS completed	7	3	0	10
3b. Explanation given why allegation did not meet legal definition of maltreatment	0	8	2	10
4. Safety factors documented on Intake Assessment not discovered by intake worker	0	10	0	10
5. Assessment made utilizing SCDSS Risk Matrix	10	0	0	10
6a. Risk Matrix results included statements contradictory to allegation	4	6	0	10
6b. Risk Matrix results failed to include all statements that support allegation	7	3	0	10
7. Contact with necessary collaterals prior to screen-out decision	6	2	2	10
8. Another intake referral on same perpetrator and/or child within 12 months	5	5	0	10
9. Intake Supervisor ensured consultation with another supervisory-level authority	0	5	5	10

*Note: A single case may have more than one issue identified.

The percentage of *strengths* is also calculated for the cases reviewed. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Findings of these reviews are noted in Table 12.

Table 12. Summary of Ratings for No Action Reports Review

Rating	Were agency policy and procedures followed?
<i>Strength</i>	2 (20%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	8 (80%)
Total	10 (100%)
% <i>Strengths</i>	2 (20%)

In eight of ten cases, agency policy and procedures were not followed. Information for the ratings was obtained by reviewing the case file and from CAPSS. Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* include:

- The documentation in the Maltreatment Tab in CAPSS was not thoroughly completed, with no documented explanation provided.
- The intake CPS assessment documentation and the Maltreatment Tab documentation provided inconsistent information or were contradictory.
- There was a lack of information and/or documentation to support documented results of the Risk Matrix.
- Documentation did not verify that collateral contacts were made.
- There was no documentation to indicate that a supervisor consulted with another supervisory-level individual, as required by policy.

SECTION IV: CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES UNFOUNDED REPORTS REVIEW

Five unfounded reports were reviewed to determine whether agency policy and procedures were followed. The five unfounded reports were randomly selected from the list of all reports unfounded by the county during the period under review. The review was conducted using the *South Carolina Department of Social Services Quality Assurance Review Unfounded Report Instrument*. This instrument includes a description of the allegation and items regarding three primary areas (see Table 13):

- Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment,
- Repeat maltreatment, and
- Risk assessment and safety management.

Table 13. Summary of Item Ratings for Unfounded Review

	Yes	No	N/A	Total
1A. Investigation not initiated in accordance with timeframes and requirements	2	3	0	5
1B. Face-to-face contact not made in accordance with timeframes and requirements	3	2	0	5
1C. Delays in investigation initiation or face-to-face contact beyond control of agency	0	3	2	5
2A. At least one substantiated or indicated maltreatment report	0	5	0	5
2B. One substantiated or indicated maltreatment report within six months before or after	0	0	5	5
2C. Repeat maltreatment involving the same or similar circumstances	0	0	5	5
3A. Initial assessment of risk to the children and family in the home	4	1	0	5
3B. Ongoing assessment(s) of risk to the children and family in the home	1	4	0	5
3C. Safety concerns that were not adequately or appropriately addressed by the agency	2	3	0	5

*Note: A single case may have more than one issue identified.

The percentage of *strengths* is calculated for each decision to unfound. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Findings of these reviews are noted in Table 14.

Table 14. Summary of Ratings for Unfounded Review

Rating	Were agency policy and procedures followed?
<i>Strength</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	5 (100%)
Total	5 (100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	0 (0%)

Information for the ratings was obtained by reviewing the case file and from CAPSS. Reasons that the unfounded cases reviewed violated agency policy and procedures include:

- Documentation did not support sufficient initial, ongoing, and/or final risk assessments with children in the home.

SECTION V: FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES REVIEW

A review of five allegations was completed to determine whether agency policy and procedures were followed for reports referred to Family Support Services (FSS). The reports were randomly selected from the list of reports referred to a Community-Based Prevention Services Provider by the county during the period under review. The *South Carolina Department of Social Services Quality Assurance Review Community-Based Prevention Services Assessment Instrument* was used to conduct the review. This instrument includes a description of the allegation and sixteen questions regarding the referral to the (FSS) Community-Based Prevention Services Provider and processes (see Table 15).

Table 15. Summary of Item Ratings for Assessment

	Yes	No	NA	Total
1. Illegal substance use alleged AND reason for safety threatened with harm	0	5	0	5
2. Use of CAPSS and/or other systems for prior involvement	5	0	0	5
3a. Maltreatment tab in CAPSS completed	3	2	0	5
3b. Explanation for “no” in maltreatment tab	1	2	2	5
4. Existing Safety Factors not seen by intake worker or documented	1	4	0	5
5. Assessment made utilizing SCDSS Risk Matrix	5	0	0	5
6a. Results of SCDSS Risk Matrix contradicted allegation made by reporter	3	2	0	5
6b. Did results fail to include statements to support allegations made by reporter	5	0	0	5
7. Agency contacted collaterals for Community-Based Prevention Services	1	3	1	5
8. Additional intake referral made on same perpetrator AND/OR child	0	5	0	5
9. Family received community-based prevention services	0	0	5	5
10. Community-based provider entered an account in CAPSS	5	0	0	5

*Note: A single case may have more than one issue identified.

The percentage of *strengths* is also calculated for the cases reviewed. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Findings of these reviews are noted in Table 16.

Table 16. Summary of Ratings for FSS Review

Rating	Were agency policy and procedures followed?
<i>Strength</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	5 (100%)
Total	5 (100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	0 (0%)

Information for the ratings was obtained by reviewing the case file and from CAPSS. In five cases reviewed agency policy and procedures were not followed. Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* include:

- Documentation did not verify that collateral contacts were made.
- Documentation of the risk assessments for children in the home were not adequate or were not ongoing.
- There was no documentation that the agency attempted to obtain the information from the child’s physician.

- The documentation of the intake CPS assessment and the documentation in the Maltreatment Tab of CAPSS provided inconsistent documentation or were contradictory.
- The documentation of the results of the Risk Matrix included statements contradictory to the documentation of the allegations made in CAPSS.
- There was a lack of documentation in the record to support the results of the documentation of the Risk Matrix.
- The Risk Matrix result documentation did not include documentation regarding the family's history with the agency as noted in the documentation in CAPSS.
- Documentation of the safety factors was not noted and/or the agency failed to document selections for areas which related to the documentation of the intake report.

APPENDIX 1. SUMMARY OF ISSUES CAUSING AREA NEEDING IMPROVEMENT (ANI) RATINGS FOR APPLICABLE CASES

The following is an overview of *strengths* and *area needing improvement* that were found in the cases for Horry County during the review conducted April 7-11, 2014. The period under review was October 1, 2013 to March 31, 2014.

Positives:

Items 2 (Repeat Maltreatment) and 10 (Other planned permanent living arrangement) were identified as *strengths* of the agency; all applicable cases reviewed were rated as *strength* with no *area needing improvement*.

Concerns:

The following examines the *items* that had the highest ANI ratings.

- *Item 3 (Services to family)* - 13 of 20 (65%) applicable cases rated as ANI
 - The agency did not make concerted efforts to provide appropriate services to the family to prevent the children from entering foster care. (9 cases)
 - The agency did not make concerted efforts to engage the mother and father in treatment services. (4 cases) Cases that provided specific reasoning noted the following issues:
 - Criminal Domestic Violence counseling (1 case)
 - Drug and alcohol treatment and psychological screens (1 case)
 - Random drug screen testing (2 cases)
 - The agency failed to assess the alternative caregiver for safety-related services on an ongoing basis. (1 case)
 - The agency did not make concerted efforts in a timely manner to provide appropriate safety services for the family. (2 cases) A case that provided specific reasoning noted the following issue:
 - There was a delay of three months during the PUR in the mother and father's active participation in services.

- *Item 4 (Risk assessment and safety management)* - 18 of 30 (60%) applicable cases rated as ANI
 - Safety concerns were not appropriately addressed by the agency. (4 cases) A case that provided specific reasoning noted the following issues:
 - The agency specifically failed to include a father who was living in the home in the documented safety plan.

- Risk and safety assessments were not ongoing. (14 cases) Cases that provided specific reasoning noted the following issues:
 - The agency failed to complete the alternative caregiver’s site and affidavit forms or provide documentation in CAPSS as required by policy. (2 cases)
 - The agency never visited the target child in the first foster home. (1 case)
 - The agency failed to provide documentation that appropriate background checks were completed as required. (3 cases)
 - The agency failed to visit the minor child in the alternative caregiver’s home as required.

- *Item 7 (Permanency Goal for Child)* – 8 of 15 (53.3%) applicable cases rated as *ANI*
 - The target child’s concurrent goal of placement with relatives was not specified in the case file. (2 cases)
 - The agency established a plan of reunification with the parent, but the goal was not appropriate given the mother’s lack of compliance, and the agency not working with her towards reunification. (1 case)
 - The concurrent goal of reunification/ adoption was not appropriate. (5 cases) Cases that provided specific reasoning noted the following issues:
 - In one case, the goal of adoption was not appropriate because the target child refused to participate in any adoption recruitment by the adoption specialist that was assigned to the case, and the agency failed to make efforts to “unpack the no” but continued with the goal.
 - The agency did not establish the goal of reunification, permanent placement, and/or adoption in a timely manner. (2 cases)

- *Item 9 (Adoption)* – All three of the applicable cases (100%) were rated *ANI*
 - The agency did not make concerted efforts to have the goals of adoption finalized in a timely manner. (2 cases)
 - The permanency goal of adoption was not achieved within 24 months of the target child’s entry into foster care. (1 case)

- *Item 13 (Visiting with parents & siblings in foster care)* – 12 of 15 (80%) applicable cases rated as *ANI*
 - According to agency policy requirements, the frequency of visits between the child and family was insufficient for the following people: (9 cases)
 - Fathers (8 cases)
 - Mothers (5 cases)

- Sibling(s) (3 cases)
 - The quality of visits between the child and family was insufficient. (4 cases)
- *Item 16 (Relationship of child in care with parents) – 9 of 15 (60%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
 - The parents were not invited to special appointments outside of regular visitation. (6 cases) Cases that indicated specific appointments noted the following:
 - Medical (6 cases)
 - Education (4 cases)
 - Mothers were not actively involved by the agency. (4 cases)
 - The agency did not make efforts to locate a father. (1 case)
 - The agency had no contact with a father after his home study was denied. (1 case)
- *Item 17 (Needs and services of child, parents, & foster parents) – 24 of 30 (80%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
 - The agency failed to adequately assess needs and provide services for the following people: (17 cases)
 - Mothers (15 cases)
 - Fathers (14 cases)
 - Children (4 cases)
 - Foster parents (1 case)
 - The agency did not provide ongoing assessments to continually address the needs of the family. (13 cases)
 - The agency did not make initial assessments to address the needs of the family. (10 cases)
 - The agency did not make efforts to locate the father. (3 cases)
- *Item 18 (Child & family involvement in case planning) – 22 of 30 (73.3%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
 - The agency failed to make concerted efforts to involve the following people in the case planning process: (22 cases)
 - Fathers (8 cases)
 - Mothers (4 cases)
 - Parents (10 cases)
 - Child(ren) (3 cases)

- *Item 20 (Caseworker visits with parents)* – 23 of 29 (79.3%) applicable cases rated as *ANI*
 - The frequency of the visits was insufficient according to agency policy requirements for the following people: (21 cases)
 - Fathers (4 cases)
 - Mothers (6 cases)
 - Parents (12 cases)
 - The quality of the visits was insufficient with the following: (14 cases)
 - Father (7 cases)
 - Mother (10 cases)
 - Parents (2 cases)
 - The agency did not make concerted efforts to locate the father for the purpose of visitation. (1 case)

- *Item 22 (Physical health of child)* – 13 of 22 (59.1%) applicable cases rated as *ANI*
 - The agency did not assess the child’s dental health needs. (4 cases)
 - The following records were not located in the case file as required by policy: (8 cases)
 - Dental (5 cases)
 - Medical/Physical (4 cases)
 - BabyNet referrals were not made. (2 cases)
 - The agency did not ensure that a recommended medical exam was completed. (1 case)