

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

This summary report describes the results of the South Carolina Department of Social Services (DSS) Charleston County Quality Assurance Review, conducted January 12-16, 2015. The period under review was January 1, 2014 to December 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 fifteen foster care and fifteen 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 Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (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	63% (10)	31% (5)	6% (1)
Safety 2 CHILDREN ARE SAFELY MAINTAINED IN THEIR HOMES WHENEVER POSSIBLE AND APPROPRIATE	40% (12)	17% (5)	43% (13)
Permanency 1 CHILDREN HAVE PERMANENCY AND STABILITY IN THEIR LIVING SITUATIONS	27% (4)	53% (8)	20% (3)
Permanency 2 THE CONTINUITY OF FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND CONNECTIONS IS PRESERVED FOR CHILDREN	33% (5)	54% (8)	13% (2)
Well-Being 1 FAMILIES HAVE ENHANCED CAPACITY TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN’S NEEDS	30% (9)	33% (10)	37% (11)
Well-Being 2 CHILDREN RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS	67% (10)	0% (0)	33% (5)
Well-Being 3 CHILDREN RECEIVE ADEQUATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS	44% (12)	26% (7)	30% (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*. This number is divided into the number of *strengths* 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>	33% (10)	43% (13)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	20% (6)	3% (1)
<i>Not Applicable</i>	47% (14)	54% (16)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	62.5% (10)	92.9% (13)

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>	34% (10)	43% (13)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	43% (13)	57% (17)
<i>Not Applicable</i>	23% (7)	0% (0)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	43.5% (10)	43.3% (13)

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	20% (6)	17% (5)	33% (10)	17% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Area needing improvement	3% (1)	33% (10)	17% (5)	13% (4)	23% (7)	3% (1)
Not Applicable	77% (23)	50% (15)	50% (15)	70% (21)	77% (23)	97% (29)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)
% Strengths	85.7% (6)	33.3% (5)	66.7% (10)	55.6% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)

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	23% (7)	10% (3)	7% (2)	33% (10)	30% (9)	10% (3)
Area needing improvement	10% (3)	17% (5)	33% (10)	13% (4)	20% (6)	27% (8)
Not Applicable	67% (20)	73% (22)	60% (18)	54% (16)	50% (15)	63% (19)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)
% Strengths	70% (7)	37.5% (3)	16.7% (2)	71.4% (10)	60% (9)	27.3% (3)

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	33% (10)	27% (8)	63% (19)	10% (3)
Area needing improvement	67% (20)	67% (20)	37% (11)	73% (22)
Not Applicable	0% (0)	6% (2)	0% (0)	17% (5)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)
% Strengths	33.3% (10)	28.6% (8)	63.3% (19)	12% (3)

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	17% (5)
Not Applicable	50% (15)
Total	100% (30)
% Strengths	66.7% (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>	43% (13)	30% (9)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	40% (12)	27% (8)
Not Applicable	17% (5)	43% (13)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	52% (13)	52.9% (9)

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

Item	May 2013 (PUR 5-1-2012 to 4-30-2013)	Sept 2013 (PUR 9-1-2012 to 8-31-2013)	Jan 2014 (PUR 9-1-2013 to 12-31-2013)	January 2015 (PUR 1-1-2014 to 12-31-2014)
1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations	77.8%	71.4%	100%	62.5%
2. Reoccurrence of Maltreatment	100%	92.3%	100%	92.9%
3. Services to Family	72.7%	47.6%	45%	43.5%
4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	60%	46.7%	50%	43.3%
5. Foster Care Re-Entries	100%	100%	100%	85.7%
6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	73.3%	53.3%	80%	33.3%
7. Permanency Goal for Child	53.3%	53.3%	53.3%	66.7%
8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Perm. Placement with Relatives	57.1%	50%	36.4%	55.6%
9. Adoption	28.6%	25%	0%	0%
10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	60%	100%	100%	0%
11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	90.9%	100%	83.3%	70%
12. Placement with Siblings	63.6%	66.7%	72.7%	37.5%
13. Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	23.1%	45.5%	28.6%	16.7%
14. Preserving Connections	42.9%	57.1%	46.7%	71.4%
15. Relative Placement	46.2%	58.3%	42.9%	60%
16. Relationship of Child in Care with Parent	20%	22.2%	41.7%	27.3%
17. Needs and Services for Child, Parents, and Caregivers	46.7%	43.3%	36.7%	33.3%
18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	43.3%	39.3%	34.5%	28.6%
19. Worker Visits with Child	53.3%	70%	70%	63.3%
20. Worker Visits with Parents	11.5%	18.2%	11.5%	12%
21. Educational Needs of the Child	68.8%	80%	58.3%	66.7%
22. Physical Health of the Child	34.8%	40.9%	42.1%	52%
23. Mental Health of the Child	71.4%	56%	45%	52.9%

SECTION II: FOSTER HOME LICENSE REVIEW

As part of the Quality Assurance Review Process in Charleston County, ten Foster Home Licenses were randomly selected from the list of all licenses issued and renewed 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*:

- 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
- 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 Charleston County

Initial License Cases. One foster home issuance for an initial/standard license was reviewed. Information for ratings was obtained by reviewers through case file documentation, which includes the use of CAPSS. This case was rated as *strength* because all pieces of the licensing requirements were met prior to authorization of the license issuance.

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

Table 10. Summary of Ratings for Initial and Renewal Cases

Rating	Initial	Renewal
<i>Strength</i>	1 (100%)	3 (33%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	0 (0%)	6 (67%)
Total	1 (100%)	9 (100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	1 (100%)	3 (33%)

- Documentation in the case file and/or CAPSS did not verify that central registry, SLED, sex offender registry, and/or FBI checks for all applicable individuals were completed in a timely manner or at all. (6 cases)
- There was no documentation in the licensing record of a medical statement for the foster parent’s grandson. (1 case)
- Documentation did not provide verification that ammunition was stored in a separate, locked location away from the firearms. (1 case)
- There was no documentation to verify fire drills were conducted within 24 hours of accepting a placement. (1 case)

Deficiencies found in Renewal Cases. Deficiencies were noted for nine files reviewed. Issues identified by the reviewers include:

Documentation:

- Documentation did not verify that the license was returned to a standard license after children, whom the exception was made for, were removed from home. (1 case)
- Documentation did not include identification of an alternative caregiver/ babysitter. (1 case)

- Documentation indicated that a child was residing in the home that was younger than the license allowed. (1 case)

Fire Drills:

- Documentation verifying that fire drills were conducted within 24 hours of a child's placement could not be located in the case file. (8 cases)
- Documentation verifying that quarterly fire drills were conducted while children were placed in foster homes could not be located in the case file. (5 cases)

Home Visits:

- Documentation did not provide verification that quarterly home visits were either timely or completed at all. (4 cases)

Safety:

- Documentation verifying that all discipline agreements were completed could not be located in the case file. (2 cases)
- Documentation did not indicate that all disaster plans were located in the case file. (2 cases)

SECTION III: 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 11):

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

Table 11. Summary of Item Ratings for Unfounded Review

1A. Investigation not initiated in accordance with timeframes and requirements. Total cases issue is present: 0				
1B. Face-to-face contact not made in accordance with timeframes and requirements. Total cases issue is present: 2				
	Yes	No	N/A	Total
1C. Delays in investigation initiation or face-to-face contact beyond control of agency	0	2	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	0	0	5	5
3A. Initial assessment of risk to the children and family in the home	1	3	1	5
3B. Ongoing assessment(s) of risk to the children and family in the home	0	5	0	5
3C. Safety concerns that were not adequately or appropriately addressed by the agency	0	5	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 12.

Table 12. 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 ratings was obtained by reviewers through case file documentation, which includes the use of CAPSS. Reasons that five unfounded cases reviewed violated pieces of agency policy and procedures include:

- There was no documentation in the case file to verify that initial, ongoing, and/or final risk and safety assessments with the children in their home were conducted. (4 cases)
- There was no documentation to verify that the home was assessed for safety hazards. (3 cases)
- The agency did not complete thorough, ongoing risk and safety assessment prior to unbounding the case. (1 case)

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 Charleston County conducted January 12-16, 2015. The period under review was January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2014.

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

- *Item 3 (Services to family)* - 13 of 23 (56.5%) applicable cases rated as ANI
 - The agency did not make concerted efforts to provide services to the following individuals: (13 cases)
 - Family (4 cases)
 - Mother (4 cases)
 - Father (3 cases)
 - Alternative caregiver (2 cases)
 - The agency did not thoroughly assess the following individuals for safety related services: (5 cases)
 - Father (3 cases)
 - Mother (3 cases)
 - Mother's paramour (1 case)
 - The agency did not file for court intervention in a timely manner. (1 case)
- *Item 4 (Risk assessment and safety management)* - 17 of 30 (56.7%) applicable cases rated as ANI
 - The agency did not complete assessments for the following individuals. (17 cases)
 - Child(ren) (14 cases)
 - Mother (5 cases)
 - Father (5 cases)
 - Adult siblings, living in the same home (1 case)
 - Mother's paramour (1 case)
 - The agency did not complete assessments of the family home. (3 cases)
 - The agency did not conduct background checks on all applicable members of the family living in the household. (3 cases)
 - The agency did not conduct a diligent search for a missing parent, which prevented required assessments for risk and safety. (1 case)
 - The agency did not make concerted efforts to locate a child prior to turning 18 to assess for risk and safety. (1 case)
- *Item 6 (Stability of foster care placements)* – 10 of 15 (66.7%) applicable cases rated as ANI
 - The child had more than one placement change during the PUR. (7 cases)

- The foster care placement was not appropriate due to being unsafe and/or unstable. Specific issues identified include: (2 cases)
 - There was a concern for the foster mother’s inability to keep the child from sneaking out of the home. (1 case)
 - The target child did not have a good rapport with the foster mother and had conflict with another foster child in the home. (1 case)
- The agency placed the child in a temporary setting until an adoptive resource could be located. (1 case)
- *Item 9 (Adoption) – 7 of 7 (100%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
 - The agency did not make concerted efforts to achieve the goal of adoption in a timely manner. Cases where specific issues were identified noted the following: (7 cases)
 - The agency did not make concerted efforts to find an adoptive resource for the child. (2 cases)
 - The agency was unable to obtain a TPR for the child in a timely manner because the father contested the TPR and there were court delays. (1 case)
 - The agency failed to file for TPR in a timely manner with no identified barriers. (1 case)
 - Adoption could not been finalized due to delayed court hearings. The child had been in care for 29 months before finalizing adoption during the PUR. (1 case)
- *Item 10 (Other planned permanent living arrangement (OPPLA) – 1 of 1 (100%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
 - The agency did not make concerted efforts to establish a permanent, stable living arrangement for the target child prior to being incarcerated.
- *Item 12 (Placement with siblings)) – 5 of 8 (62.5%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
 - The child was not placed with his/her siblings in foster care. (5 cases)
 - The child was separated from his/her siblings. Specific reasons provided include: (2 cases)
 - The foster home lacked space for both siblings to stay. (1 case)
 - The target child was moved due to behavioral issues. There was no evidence that the agency attempted to place the siblings together again after this move. (1 case)
- *Item 13 (Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care) – 10 of 12 (83.3%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
 - The frequency of the visits with the following family members was not sufficient: (8 cases)
 - Mother (6 cases)
 - Father (3 cases)

- Siblings (2 cases)
 - The agency did not attempt to arrange visits between the child and parent. (2 cases)
 - The agency did not conduct a timely diligent search for the missing parent, which prevented the visit between parent and child. (1 case)
- *Item 16 (Relationship of child in care with parents) – 8 of 11 (72.7%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
 - The agency did not make concerted efforts to promote, support, and maintain positive relationships between the child and family. (6 cases)
Specific relationships affected include:
 - Child and mother (4 cases)
 - Child and father (4 cases)
 - Specific events that family members were not invited to include the following: (6 cases)
 - Medical appointments (6 cases)
 - School-related activities (2 cases)
- *Item 17 (Needs and services of child, parents, & foster parents) – 20 of 30 (66.7%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
 - Assessments for risk and safety were not conducted for the following individuals: (17 cases)
 - Father(s) (15 cases)
 - Mother (9 cases)
 - Foster mother (1 case)
 - Paramour (1 case)
 - Children (1 case)
 - The agency did not make concerted efforts to provide services for the following individuals: (7 cases)
 - Father (6 cases)
 - Mother (5 cases)
 - Foster parents (1 case)
 - The agency failed to seek court intervention when a father was noncompliant with treatment services. (1 case)
 - Diligent searches were not conducted for a missing parent, which prohibited proper assessment of needs and provision of services. (1 case)
- *Item 18 (Child & family involvement in case planning) –20 of 28 (71.4%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
 - The agency failed to make concerted efforts to involve the following individuals in the case planning process: (15 cases)
 - Father(s) (14 cases)
 - Mother (12 cases)
 - Children (5 cases)

- A diligent search was not conducted to allow for the missing parent to be included in the case planning process. (5 cases)
- *Item 20 (Caseworker visits with parents) – 22 of 25 (88%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
 - The frequency of visits with the following individuals was insufficient. (21 cases)
 - Father(s) (17 cases)
 - Mother (17 cases)
 - Paramour (1 case)
 - The quality of visits between the agency and the following individuals was insufficient: (12 cases)
 - Mother (10 cases)
 - Father(s) (6 cases)
 - Diligent searches were not conducted for a missing parent, which prevented the required visits with the caseworker. (4 cases)