

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

This summary report describes the results of the South Carolina Department of Social Services (DSS) Greenville County Quality Assurance Review, conducted May 19-23, 2014. The period under review was November 1, 2013 to April 30, 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 CHILDREN ARE, FIRST AND FOREMOST, PROTECTED FROM ABUSE AND NEGLECT	80% (4)	20% (1)	0% (0)
Safety 2 CHILDREN ARE SAFELY MAINTAINED IN THEIR HOMES WHENEVER POSSIBLE AND APPROPRIATE	70% (21)	7% (2)	23% (7)
Permanency 1 CHILDREN HAVE PERMANENCY AND STABILITY IN THEIR LIVING SITUATIONS	40% (6)	60% (9)	0% (0)
Permanency 2 THE CONTINUITY OF FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND CONNECTIONS IS PRESERVED FOR CHILDREN	53% (8)	40% (6)	7% (1)
Well-Being 1 FAMILIES HAVE ENHANCED CAPACITY TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN’S NEEDS	57% (17)	43% (13)	0% (0)
Well-Being 2 CHILDREN RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS	84% (10)	8% (1)	8% (1)
Well-Being 3 CHILDREN RECEIVE ADEQUATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS	58% (15)	19% (5)	23% (6)

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 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>	17% (5)	14% (4)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	0% (0)	3% (1)
<i>Not Applicable</i>	83% (25)	83% (25)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	100% (5)	80% (4)

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>	47% (14)	70% (21)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	20% (6)	30% (9)
<i>Not Applicable</i>	33% (10)	0% (0)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	70% (14)	70% (21)

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	17% (5)	47% (14)	37% (11)	13% (4)	17% (5)	3% (1)
Area needing improvement	0% (0)	3% (1)	13% (4)	13% (4)	13% (4)	7% (2)
Not Applicable	83% (25)	50% (15)	50% (15)	74% (22)	70% (21)	90% (27)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)
% Strengths	100% (5)	93.3% (14)	73.3%(11)	50% (4)	55.6% (5)	33.3% (1)

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	20% (6)	27% (8)	13% (4)	33% (10)	20% (6)	20% (6)
Area needing improvement	7% (2)	3% (1)	17% (5)	17% (5)	20% (6)	10% (3)
Not Applicable	73% (22)	70% (21)	70% (21)	50% (15)	60% (18)	70% (21)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)
% Strengths	75% (6)	88.9% (8)	44.4% (4)	66.7% (10)	50% (6)	66.7% (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
Strength	63% (19)	60% (18)	93% (28)	37% (11)
Area needing improvement	37% (11)	30% (9)	7% (2)	37% (11)
Not Applicable	0% (0)	10% (3)	0% (0)	26% (8)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)
% Strengths	63.3% (19)	66.7% (18)	93.3% (28)	50% (11)

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
Strength	33% (10)
Area needing improvement	7% (2)
Not Applicable	60% (18)
Total	100% (30)
% Strengths	83.3% (10)

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>	54% (16)	43% (13)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	23% (7)	14% (4)
Not Applicable	23% (7)	43% (13)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	69.6% (16)	76.5% (13)

Table 9. Greenville County Percentage of Strengths on 23 Quality Assurance Items Across Four Reviews

Item	Feb. 2013 PUR (2-1- 2012 to 1- 31-2013)	June 2013 PUR (6-1- 2012 to 5- 30-2013)	Nov. 2013 PUR (6-1- 2013 to 10- 31-2013)	May 2014 PUR (11-1- 2013 to 4- 30-2014)
1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations	84.2%	95.2%	83.3%	100%
2. Reoccurrence of Maltreatment	94.7%	95.2%	80%	80%
3. Services to Family	79.3%	69%	64.7%	70%
4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	77.5%	57.5%	73.3%	70%
5. Foster Care Re-Entries	100%	87.5%	100%	100%
6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	85%	65%	73.3%	93.3%
7. Permanency Goal for Child	65%	65%	73.3%	73.3%
8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Perm. Placement with Relatives	87.5%	77.8%	66.7%	50%
9. Adoption	23.1%	27.3%	37.5%	55.6%
10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	100%	100%	100%	33.3%
11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	93.8%	92.3%	88.9%	75%
12. Placement with Siblings	93.3%	57.1%	62.5%	88.9%
13. Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	58.8%	50%	45.5%	44.4%
14. Preserving Connections	78.9%	77.8%	85.7%	66.7%
15. Relative Placement	68.8%	62.5%	58.3%	50%
16. Relationship of Child in Care with Parent	56.3%	40%	25%	66.7%
17. Needs and Services for Child, Parents, and Caregivers	65%	55%	70%	63.3%
18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	54.1%	64.9%	78.6%	66.7%
19. Worker Visits with Child	75%	80%	86.7%	93.3%
20. Worker Visits with Parents	34.4%	32.3%	54.5%	50%
21. Educational Needs of the Child	90%	88.2%	100%	83.3%
22. Physical Health of the Child	86.1%	57.6%	69.6%	69.6%
23. Mental Health of the Child	78.6%	60.7%	65%	76.5%

SECTION II: FOSTER HOME LICENSE REVIEW

As part of the Quality Assurance Review Process in Greenville 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
- DHEC/Lead inspections
- 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
- Fire inspections
- 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 *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 Greenville County

Initial License Cases. Four foster care issuances for initial/standard license were reviewed. One of the cases reviewed was rated as *ANI* because all of the licensing requirements were not met prior to authorization of the license issuance. Information for ratings was obtained by reviewers through case file documentation, which includes the use of CAPSS. Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* for the one case include:

Firearms:

- Documentation confirming that ammunition was stored in a separate, locked location away from the firearms was not in the case file.

Pet Vaccination Records:

- Pet vaccinations were not up-to-date or not on file.

Renewal License Cases. Five of six cases reviewed were rated as *ANI* because all of the licensing requirements were not met prior to authorization of the license renewal. Information for ratings was obtained by reviewers through case file documentation, which includes the use of CAPSS. Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* for five cases include:

Table 10. Summary of Ratings for Initial and Renewal Cases

Rating	Initial	Renewal
<i>Strength</i>	3 (75%)	1 (16.7%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	1 (25%)	5 (83.3%)
Total	4 (100%)	6 (100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	3 (75%)	1 (16.7%)

Background Checks:

- There was not documentation in the case file to support that central registry, SLED, sex offender registry checks, and/or FBI checks for all appropriate individuals were completed in a timely manner, or were completed at all.
- There was no documentation verifying that all appropriate individuals completed finger print checks.

Safety:

- Following a screened out allegation, there was no documented evidence confirming that the agency followed up with the family to address concerns.

Documentation:

- There was a discrepancy between CAPSS system documentation and quarterly home visit documentation regarding who was listed as members of the household.

Firearms:

- Documentation confirming that ammunition was stored in a separate, locked location away from the firearms was not in the case file.
- Documentation indicated that ammunition and guns were stored together in a locked/hidden gun safe rather than being in separate, locked locations.

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 for all ten files reviewed. Issues identified by the reviewers include:

Initial Case Deficiencies

Alternative Caregiver:

- An alternative caregiver/babysitter was not identified in the case file documentation.

Documentation:

- The initial home study in the case file was not signed or dated by the licensing worker or supervisor.
- The wrong family name was listed on the addendum home study.
- The autobiographies did not contain a date or signature.
- There was a discrepancy between narratives/dictation and CAPSS regarding the number of children for which the home was licensed.

Renewal Case Deficiencies

Alternative Caregiver:

- Documentation did not include identification of an alternative caregiver/ babysitter.
- Alternative caregiver forms were not located in the licensing file.

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:

- Documentation did not provide verification that quarterly home visits were completed in a timely manner.
- All Discipline Agreements were not located in the case file.
- 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 ten 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	0	10	0	10
2. Use of CAPSS and/or other systems for prior involvement	8	2	0	10
3. Maltreatment tab in CAPSS completed	6	4	0	10
4. Safety factors documented on Intake Assessment not discovered by intake worker	2	8	0	10
5. Assessment made utilizing SCDSS Risk Matrix	5	0	5	10
6a. Risk Matrix results included statements contradictory to allegation	3	2	5	10
6b. Risk Matrix results failed to include all statements that support allegation	7	0	3	10
7. Contact with necessary collaterals prior to screen-out decision	1	5	4	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	1	4	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>	0 (0%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	10 (100%)
Total	10 (100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	0 (0%)

In all ten cases, agency policy and procedures were not followed. Information for ratings was obtained by reviewers through case file documentation, which includes the use of CAPSS. Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* include:

- Documentation regarding the family history in CAPSS did not reflect that the mother’s maiden name was used when researching.
- Concerted efforts to locate an address or identify the names of parents could not be confirmed by documentation in the case file.
- Documentation regarding family composition was unclear and inadequate.
- The Risk Matrix results documented included statements that were contradictory to the documentation of the allegation.
- The agency failed to include, in the Risk Matrix and/or other documentation, statements that supported allegations made by the reporter.

- The agency failed to document, through the Risk Matrix assessment, isolated incidents of abuse and neglect relating to the family's history with the agency.
- As determined by the reviewer, through an evaluation of available documentation and information, all applicable safety and/or risk factors were not identified at intake.
- Information documented under the Sufficiency Tab on the CPS intake assessment was either conflicting or incorrect.
- Incorrect documentation completed under the Sufficiency Tab resulted in a failure to complete the Risk Matrix.
- The agency failed to document acts in the home, which placed the child at risk of minor pain or injury and also a mental, emotional, intellectual, or physical impairment that could mildly interfere with the ability to parent.
- There was not documentation to support that the agency made efforts to complete appropriate, time-relevant, and/or necessary collateral contacts.
- Although there was documentation that the agency was aware of bruising to a child's face, there was no documentation that an inquiry was made to determine how those bruises developed.

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	2	3	0	5
1C. Delays in investigation initiation or face-to-face contact beyond control of agency	2	0	3	5
2A. At least one substantiated or indicated maltreatment report	1	4	0	5
2B. One substantiated or indicated maltreatment report within six months before or after	0	1	4	5
2C. Repeat maltreatment involving the same or similar circumstances	1	0	4	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>	1 (20%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	4 (80%)
Total	5 (100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	1 (20%)

Information for ratings was obtained by reviewers through case file documentation, which includes the use of CAPSS. Reasons that four unfounded cases reviewed violated agency policy and procedures include:

- Documentation did not indicate sufficient initial, ongoing, and/or final risk assessments with children in the home.
- There was no documented contact with indicated collaterals.
- Documentation did not provide verification that safety concerns were addressed prior to the decision to unfound the case.
- The occurrence of a final visit prior to unbounding the case was not noted in case file documentation.
- There was no documentation for an indicated referral for BabyNet being made.

- Documentation did not support that a diligent search was completed for parents when they were missing.
- The decision to unfind the case was made prior to receiving the results of a drug screening according to documentation in the case file.
- The agency made the decision to unfind after documenting positive drug screens for both parents without documentation of reasoning to do so.
- There was no documentation to support that risk and safety assessments were conducted for all caregivers with whom children resided.

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 eleven 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	4	1	0	5
3. Maltreatment tab in CAPSS completed	5	0	0	5
4. Existing Safety Factors not seen by intake worker or documented	2	3	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	0	2	3	5
8. Additional intake referral made on same perpetrator AND/OR child	2	3	0	5
9. Family received community-based prevention services	0	2	3	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 ratings was obtained by reviewers through case file documentation, which includes the use of 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.
- There was no documentation that all of the family history noted in CAPSS was assessed at the time of intake as required.

- All applicable safety factors were not documented/identified at intake as required. The Risk Matrix documentation included statements that were contradictory to the documentation of the allegations.
- The Risk Matrix documentation failed to include statements that supported the documentation of the allegations.
- The Risk Matrix documentation failed to include all relevant statements.

SECTION VI: VOLUNTARY CASE MANAGEMENT REVIEW

A review of five allegations was completed to determine whether agency policy and procedures were followed for reports referred to Voluntary Case Management (VCM). 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 eleven questions regarding the referral to the VCM Community-Based Prevention Services Provider and processes (see Table 17).

Table 17. Summary of Item Ratings for Assessment

	Yes	No	NA	Total
1. Illegal substance use alleged AND reason for safety threatened with harm	1	4	0	5
2. Use of CAPSS and/or other systems for prior involvement	5	1	0	5
3. Maltreatment tab in CAPSS completed	3	2	0	5
4. Existing Safety Factors not seen by intake worker or documented	2	3	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. Risk Matrix did not include statements that supported allegations	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	1	4	0	5
9. Family received community-based prevention services	1	1	3	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 18.

Table 18. Summary of Ratings for VCM 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 ratings was obtained by reviewers through case file documentation, which includes the use of CAPSS. In five cases reviewed agency policy and procedures were not followed. Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* include:

- The Risk Matrix included contradictory statements and/or failed to include statements that supported the documentation of the allegations.
- All relevant statements were not included in the Risk Matrix documentation.
- There was no documented contact with indicated collaterals.

- All applicable safety factors were not documented/identified at the time of intake as required.
- There was no documentation that the agency completed the caregiver risk assessment.
- The Maltreatment Tab was not thoroughly and/or correctly completed, as the documented answer did not correspond with the documented allegation.
- The agency determined, through the completion of the Maltreatment and Sufficiency Tab, that the allegations met the legal definition of maltreatment, yet documentation stated that the agency referred the intake to VCM.

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

The following is an overview of strengths and weaknesses that were found in the cases for Greenville County during the review conducted May 19-23, 2014. The period under review was November 1, 2013 to April 30, 2014.

Positives:

Items 1 (Timeliness of initiating investigations) and 5 (Foster Care reentries) were identified as *strengths* of the agency; all applicable cases reviewed were rated as *strength* with no *area needing improvement* (ANI).

Concerns:

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

- *Item 8 (Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives)* – 4 of 8 (50%) applicable cases rated as ANI
 - The agency did not make concerted efforts to achieve the goal of reunification. (4 cases) Cases that provided specific reasoning noted the following issue:
 - The agency failed to actively engage caregivers in treatment necessary to achieve the goal of reunification. (2 cases)
 - The agency did not achieve the goal of reunification in a timely manner. (2 cases) A case that provided specific reasoning noted the following issue:
 - There was a delay in the provision of services, resulting in a lack of timeliness for achieving reunification. (1 case)
 - The goal of reunification was not appropriate. (1 case) The one case noted the following issue:
 - The goal of reunification was inappropriate because the child did not have any relatives to whom she could return.

- *Item 10 (Other planned permanent living arrangement)* – 2 of 3 (66.7%) applicable cases rated as ANI
 - Concerted efforts were not made to achieve the goal of other planned permanent living arrangements in a timely manner. (2 cases) A case that provided specific reasoning noted the following issue:
 - The initial goal of reunification was not appropriate for the child as there were no viable persons for reunification; therefore, the goal of

- APPLA, which was not established until 14 months after the target child entered care, was not established timely. (1 case)
 - Efforts were not made by the agency to provide the target child with appropriate preparation for independent living. (1 case) Services not provided to adequately prepare the child included:
 - Ansell-Casey Life Skills assessment
 - Career Preparation
 - Employment/Vocational training
 - Obtaining a driver's license
 - Financial management
- *Item 13 (Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care)* – 5 of 9 (55.6%) applicable cases rated as ANI
 - The frequency of the visits was not sufficient. (5 cases) Specific members of the family that were impacted included:
 - Mother (4 cases)
 - Father (3 cases)
 - Sibling(s) (1 case)
 - The quality of the visits was not sufficient. (1 case)
 - The agency failed to observe visitation between the child and mother.
- *Item 15 (Relative placement)* – 6 of 12 (50%) applicable cases rated as ANI
 - The agency failed to make concerted efforts to identify, locate, and evaluate relatives as potential placements for the target child. (5 cases) Potential placements included:
 - Maternal relatives (5 cases)
 - Paternal relatives (5 cases)
 - Diligent searches were not conducted when family members could not be located. (2 cases) Relatives for whom diligent searches were not conducted included:
 - Maternal (2 cases)
 - Paternal (2 cases)
 - Assessments for placements were not conducted with relatives. (1 case) Relatives not assessed included:
 - Maternal relatives
- *Item 20 (Caseworker visits with parents)* – 11 of 22 (50%) applicable cases rated as ANI

- The frequency of the visits was not sufficient. (10 cases)
 - The agency specifically did not meet with the following:
 - Father(s) (8 cases)
 - Mother (6 cases)
- The quality of the visits was not sufficient. (8 cases)
 - The agency specifically did not have quality visits with the following:
 - Mother (8 cases)
 - Father (3 cases)
 - Reasons that visitation lacked quality included:
 - The visitation environment was not conducive to conducting a quality visit. (3 cases)
 - Visitation did not include discussion of issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child and/or promote the achievement of case goals. (8 cases)
 - The agency failed to obtain an interpreter for a hearing impaired parent. (1 case)
- Diligent searches were not conducted when the father could not be located. (1 case)