

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

During the week of August 14-18, 2006 a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an on-site review of child welfare services in Georgetown County. A sample of open and closed foster care and treatment cases were reviewed. Also reviewed were screened-out intakes, foster home licensing records, and unfounded investigations. (Stakeholders interviewed for this review included foster parents, DSS attorney, Alcohol and Drug Treatment Center, Family Court, Foster Parent, representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health, Sheriff's Office and Guardian Ad Litem.)

Period included in Case Record Review: February 1, 2006 to July 31, 2006

Period included in Outcome Measures: August 1, 2005 to July 31, 2006

Purpose

The Department of Social Services engages in a review of child welfare services in each county to:

- a) Determine to what degree services are delivered in compliance with federal and state laws and agency policy; and
- b) Assess the outcomes for children and families engaged in the child welfare system.

State law (sec 43-1-115) states, in part:

The state department shall conduct, at least once every five years, a substantive quality review of the child protective services and foster care programs in each county and each adoption office in the State. The county's performance must be assessed with reference to specific outcome measures published in advance by the department.

The information obtained by the child welfare services review process will:

- a) Give county staff feedback on the effectiveness of their interventions.
- b) Direct state office technical assistance staff to assist county staff with their areas needing improvement.
- c) Inform agency administrators of which systemic factors impair county staff's ability to achieve specific outcomes.
- d) Direct training staff to provide training for county staff specific to their needs.

Quantitative and Qualitative Data Sources

The county-specific review of child welfare services is both quantitative and qualitative.

The review is **quantitative** because it begins with an analysis of every child welfare outcome report for that county for the period under review. The outcome reports reflect the performance of the county in all areas of the child welfare program: Child Protective Services (CPS) Intake, CPS Investigations, CPS In-Home Treatment, Foster Care, Managed Treatment Services (MTS), and Adoptions.

The review is **qualitative** because it assesses the quality of the services rendered and the effectiveness of those services. The review seeks to explain why a county's performance data looks the way it does.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Section One

Safety Outcome 1: Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect.

Summary of Findings

Overall Finding: Substantially Achieved

-Safety Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations. **Finding: Strength**

-Safety Item 2: Repeat maltreatment. **Finding: Strength**

Analysis of Safety Item 1 Findings

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure S1.1: Timeliness of initiating investigations on reports of child maltreatment

Data Time Period: 08/1/05 to 07/31/06

	Number of Reports Accepted	Number of Investigations Initiated Timely	Number of Investigations Objective $\geq 99.99\%^*$	Number of Investigations Above (Below) Objective
State	16,263	15,677	16,261.37	-584.37
Georgetown	72	72	71.99	0.01

* This standard is based on state law. It is not a federally established objective.

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings

Safety Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	100	0	0	9	0
Treatment	5	100	0	0	5	0
Total Cases	6	100	0	0	14	0

Explanation of Item 1

This is a “Strength” for Georgetown DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. All 72 investigations conducted by Georgetown DSS over the past 12 months initiated according to state law and agency policy. The review found that all of the CPS investigations in the applicable CPS treatment and foster care cases (10 of 10) were initiated within the required timeframes onsite. This was found to be a strength in the unfounded investigations with the exception of one unfounded investigation not initiated timely in accordance to intake response time assigned by the county.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Analysis of Safety Item 2 Findings

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure S1.2: Recurrence of Maltreatment – Of all children who were victims of indicated reports of child abuse and/or neglect during the reporting period, the percent having another indicated report within a subsequent 6 month period.

Indicated Reports Between February 1, 2005 and January 31, 2006

	Number of Child Victims	Number of Child Victims In Another Founded Rept	Number of Children Objective <= 93.90%	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	10,179	73	9558.08	547.92
Georgetown	59	0	55.40	3.60

Note: This is a federally established objective.

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings

Safety Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	7	77	2	22	1	1
Total Cases	17	89	2	11	1	1

Explanation of Item 2

This is a “Strength” for Georgetown DSS. Outcome Measure data indicates that there was no repeat maltreatment between February 1, 2005 and January 31, 2006 for Georgetown. Although this is generally a strong area for Georgetown, there was repeat maltreatment in one of the 10 treatment cases reviewed onsite. Overall this suggests that interventions by the agency were effective despite the one repeat maltreatment.

Stakeholder comment:

“The caseworkers seem to do a very good job- they are up on the cases, very hard working and capable.”

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Section Two

Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

Summary of Findings

Overall Finding: Partially Achieved

-Safety Item 3: Services to prevent removal. **Finding: Area Needing Improvement**
 -Safety Item 4: Risk of harm to child (ren). **Finding: Strength**

Analysis of Safety Item 3 Findings

<u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Safety Item 3: Services to family to protect child (ren) in home and prevent removal.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	100	0	0	8	0
Treatment	7	78	2	22	1	1
Total Cases	9	82	2	18	9	0

Item 3

This is an “Area Needing Improvement for Georgetown DSS. Onsite review indicates that 2 out of the 10 treatment cases reviewed services in the home were not adequate. For instance, in one case the family has a history of DSS intervention. The most recent involvement with that family had issues of Criminal Domestic Violence. The agency failed to assess those issues and the follow-up with appropriate services were not adequate. In the other case, the underlying causes of the maltreatment that existed in the family were not addressed on the safety plan. Consequently, in both cases the children were taken into emergency protective custody.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006
Analysis of Safety Item 4 Findings**

<u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Safety Item 4: Risk of harm.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	8	80	2	20	0	0
Total Cases	18	90	2	10	0	0

<u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u>				
Measure S2.2: Risk of harm to child – Of all unfounded investigations during the reporting period, the percent receiving subsequent reports within six months of the initial report.				
	Number Alleged Child Victims in an Unfounded Rept 02/01/05 to 01/31/06	Number With Another Rept Within 6 Months of Unfounded Determination	Number of Cases Met Objective >= 91.50%*	Number of Cases Above (Below) Objective
State	14,681	1,131	13,433.12	116.89
Georgetown	42	2	38.43	1.57

* This is a DSS established objective.

Explanation of “Risk of Harm” measure

This is a “Strength” for Georgetown DSS. Onsite reviewers determine how effective the county DSS office is at managing the risks of harm that necessitate continued involvement by DSS. The review found that Risk of harm was reduced in all 10 (100%) of the applicable foster care cases reviewed onsite. In 2 of the 10 treatment cases reviewed services in the home were not adequate. Therefore, risk of harm in the home had not been adequately reduced. According to the Outcome Measure Report, the review finding is consistent.

Overall the agency is very effective in assessing safety and risk to children.

Stakeholder comment:

“The agency does a good job identifying risk factors, and they err on the side of safety. The client does have every chance to keep their children in their home.”

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Section Three

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

Summary of Findings

Overall Finding:

Partially Achieved

- Item 5: Foster care re-entries
- Item 6: Stability of foster care placemt.
- Item 7: Permanency goal for child
- Item 8: Reunification, plmt w/ relatives
- Item 9: Adoption
- Item 10: Perm goal of other planned arrangmt

Finding: Strength
Finding: Strength
Finding: Area Needing improvement
Findings: Strength
Findings: Area Needing Improvement
Findings: Strength

Analysis of Safety Permanency Item 5 Findings

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings

Permanency Item 5: Foster care re-entries.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	100	0	0	7	0

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure P3.1: **Foster Care Re-entries** – Of all children who entered care during the year under review, the percent that re-entered foster care Within 12 months of a prior foster care episode.

	Number Children Entering Care 08/01/05 to 07/31/06	Number That Were Returned Home Within The Past 12 Months From Previous Fos Care Episode	Number of Children Objective >= 91.40%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,293	243	3,009.80	40.20
Georgetown	20	1	18.28	0.72

* This is a federally established objective.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Explanation

Foster Care Re-entries is a “Strength” for Georgetown DSS. Outcome measure data indicates that only one out of the twenty children who entered foster care in Georgetown during the period under review had been returned home in the prior 12 months. Georgetown met the federal standard for foster care re-entries. None of the cases reviewed onsite involved a child re-entering foster care.

Analysis of Safety Permanency Item 6 Findings

<u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 6: Stability of foster care placement.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure P3.2: **Stability of Foster Care Placement** – Of all children who have been in foster care less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home, the percent that had not more than 2 placement settings.

	Number of Children In Care Less Than 12 Months	Number of Children With No More Than 2 Placements	Number of Children Objective $\geq 86.70\%*$	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,771	3,032	3,269.46	-237.46
Georgetown	22	18	19.07	-1.07

Note: This is a federally established objective.

Explanation

Stability of foster care placement is “Strength”. The outcome report shows that 18 of the 22 children (82%) in care less than 12 months had no more than 2 foster care placements. This is below the standard of 86.7%. As a result, Georgetown County missed this measure by one child. However, onsite reviewers found that foster care placements were stable in all 10 of the applicable foster care cases reviewed.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Analysis of Safety Permanency Item 7 Findings

<u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u>				
Measure P3.5: Permanency Goal for Child – Of all children who have been in foster care for 15 of the most recent 22 months, the percent for which a Termination of Parental Rights (TPR) petition has been filed.				
	Children in Care At Least 15 of Last 22 Months 08/05 –07/06	Number Children With TPR Complaint	Number of Children Objective >= 53.00%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,636	1,642	1,927.08	(285.08)
Georgetown	34	24	70.59	5.98

* This is DSS established objective. The federal agency, Administration for Children & Families, gathers data on this measure, but has not established a numerical objective.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 7: Permanency goal for children.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0

Explanation of Item 7

This is an “Area Needing Improvement” for Georgetown DSS. To meet the criteria established in the CAPSS report 53.00% or more of the children in care 15 of the most recent 22 months must have a TPR petition filed. For Georgetown DSS the percentage is 70.59% (24/34). Therefore the county met this standard in accordance to the Outcome Measure report. Even though Georgetown DSS filed enough TPRs to meet the outcome report standard, there are some concerns to (Item 7) that require attention.

Onsite reviewers rated this item based on two criteria: 1) Was the permanency goal appropriately matched to the child’s need? and 2) Was the agency acting to cause the goal to be achieved timely? Staff of Georgetown DSS had no problem determining the appropriate goal for the foster children in their care with the exception of two cases, one foster care and one adoption case. Those two cases were rated an Area Needing Improvement for (item 7) because the agency failed to pursue TPR actions against the parents timely; delayed permanency of a child under the age 5 causing the child to linger in foster care for 3 years with a plan of Permanent Foster Care prior to pursuing another appropriate goal for the child. In that case the child had been in care from infancy to age 4 before the adoption was finalized.

Analysis of Safety Permanency Item 8 Findings

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure P3.3: **Length of Time to Achieve Reunification** – Of all children who were reunified with their parents or caregiver, at the time of discharge from foster care, the percent reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home.

	Number of Children Where Fos Care Services Closed. Last Plan Was Return Home 08/01/05–07/31/06	Number of Children In Care Less Than 12 Months	Number Of Children Objective >= 76.20%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	2,408	1,969	1,834.90	134.10
Georgetown	9	8	6.86	1.43

* This is a federally established objective.

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings

Permanency Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	100	0	0	6	0

Explanation

This is a “Strength” for Georgetown DSS. According to the outcome data approximately 90% of the children who entered care during the 12 month reporting period returned home within 12 months of entering foster care. The review found that the children with a plan of return home or with a relative were appropriate. Those children were only in foster care 12 months or less.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Analysis of Permanency Item 9 Findings

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure P3.4: **Length of Time to Achieve Adoption** – Of all children who exited from foster care during the year under review to a finalized adoption, the percent that exited care in less than 24 months from the time of the latest removal from home.

	Number of Children With Finalized Adoption W/in Past 12 Months	Number of Children Where Adoption Was Finalized Within 24 Months of Entering Care	Number of Children Objective $\geq 32.00\%$ *	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	418	58	133.76	(75.76)
Georgetown	6	1	1.92	-0.92

Note: This is a federally established objective.

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings

Permanency Item 9: Adoption.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	20	4	80	5	0

Explanation

This is an “Area Needing Improvement”. According to the outcome report (1/ 6) adoptions were completed within the 24 months of the child entering foster care. This is consistent with the review findings onsite.

The review found that five of the ten cases had a plan of adoption. One of the five cases with the plan of adoption one was on track to be finalized within 24 months. The four cases with the plan of adoption not finalized were due to TPR pleadings not filed timely. The other five cases were not applicable.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Analysis of Permanency Item 10 Findings

<u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u>				
Measure P3.6: Permanency Goal of “Other Planned Living Arrangement” – Of all children in foster care, the percent with a permanency goal of emancipation (Indep Liv Services) or a planned permanent living arrangement other than adoption, guardianship, or return to family.				
	Number of Children In Care at Least One Day 08/01/05 – 07/31/06	Number of Children In Care With Perm Plan “Other Planned Living Arrangement”	Number of Children Objective >= 85.00%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	8,198	1,464	6,968.30	-234.30
Georgetown	32	4	12.50	0.80

* This is a DSS established objective.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 10: Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	100	0	0	9	0

Explanation-*

This is a “Strength” for Georgetown DSS. The standard for this objective is that no more than 15% of the children in foster care should have this plan (APPLA- Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement). The outcome data shows that approximately 13% of the children in Georgetown DSS custody had this plan. The onsite review found that the youth in one of the ten cases reviewed with the plan of APPLA had graduated from high school. The youth is working part-time and her future plan is to pursue higher education at a local technical college.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Section Four

Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

Summary of Findings

Overall Finding:

- Item 11: Proximity of placement
- Item 12: Placement with siblings.
- Item 13: Visiting w/ parents & siblings
- Item 14: Preserving connections
- Item 15: Relative placement
- Item 16: Relationship of child w/ parents

Substantially Achieved

- Finding: Strength**
- Finding: Strength**
- Finding: Area Needing Improvement**
- Findings: Strength**
- Findings: Area Needing Improvement**
- Findings: Area Needing Improvement**

Analysis of Permanency Item 11 Findings

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure P4.1: **Proximity of Foster Care Placement** – Of all children in foster care during the reporting period (excluding MTS and Adoptions children), the percent placed within their county of origin.

	Number of Children In Care 08/01/05 – 07/31/06	Number of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Percent of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Number of Children Objective >= 70.00%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	6,109	3,855	63.10	4,276.30	(421.30)
Georgetown	32	17	53.13	22.40	-5.40

* This is a DSS established objective.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

<u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	100	0	0	2	0

Explanation

This is a “Strength” for Georgetown DSS. To meet this objective 70%, or more, of the children in care must be placed in Georgetown County. Although the outcome report indicates that 53% (17 of 32) of the children in foster care were placed in the county, the reviewers found that 100% of the foster children reviewed were either placed within Georgetown County or in close proximity to their community in an adjacent county.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 12: Placement with siblings						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	100	0	0	4	0

Explanation

This is “Strength”. In 100 % of the cases reviewed, siblings were placed together in group homes and in pre-adoptive placements. Although Georgetown is a mid size county with only twenty seven licensed homes, the county does a great job in placing sibling groups together whenever possible. Case documentation supports reasonable justification as to why the some sibling groups of Georgetown were not placed together, as it was not in the best interest for each child.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	78	2	22	1	0

Explanation

This is an **“Area Needing Improvement.”** Reviewers determined that visits with the parents and the children in foster care were not occurring on a regular basis or as required by policy. The visits were offered to the parents by the completion of the visitation contract in the case record. However, case record contained no documentation to support the agency efforts in promoting visits between the child and parents. For example, there were no letters or correspondences sent to the parents advising them of the visitation dates. This practice was found in records with the plan of return home.

The agency put forth minimum efforts to assist the families with maintaining contact.

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 14: Preserving connections						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	89	1	11	1	0

Explanation

This is “Strength”. This item addresses the agency’s ability to preserve a child in foster care’s connection to his/her community, family, and faith. Preserving connections was rated as a strength in 89 % of the foster care cases reviewed. The agency did a good job in keeping the children in care connected to their communities and other family members. In one adoption case, the onsite reviewer found documentation to support continued contact between the child, and the biological mother and grandmother.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

<u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 15: Relative placement						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	56	4	44	1	0

Explanation

This is an “Area Needing Improvement”. This item addresses the agency’s effectiveness in identifying and assessing the relatives of children in foster care as possible caregivers. In 56% of the cases reviewed there was evidence that both maternal and paternal relatives were assessed as placement options for the children in foster care. In four of the nine applicable cases reviewed there was no evidence that paternal relatives were assessed. Although the review found this area a problem for Georgetown, overall the Stakeholders stated that “the county does an excellent job identifying fit and willing relatives, and relatives often end up adopting.” The agency efforts in assessing relatives were found to be consistent in cases with the most recent episode of children entering care during the last 6 months.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	83	1	17	4	0

Explanation

This is an “Area Needing Improvement”. This item addresses the agency’s effectiveness in promoting or maintaining a strong emotionally supportive relationship between children in care and their parents.

Reviewers determined in five of the six applicable cases that visitation was occurring frequently and the children were bonded with the parent. However in the one foster care case rated an area needing improvement, it appears that the agency’s efforts were not adequate in sending correspondences to parents regarding visitation with their children as a method of promoting the relationship between the parent and child in foster care. In the cases rated not applicable the parents whereabouts were not known, the agency was relieved of providing services to the parent, or their rights have been terminated.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Section Five

Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

Summary of Findings

Overall Finding:

Substantially Achieved

-Item 17: Needs & services

Finding: Strength

-Item 18: Involvement in case planning

Finding: Area Needing Improvement

-Item 19: Worker visits with child

Finding: Strength

-Item 20: Worker visits with parent(s)

Findings: Strength

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings

Well Being Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	8	80	2	20	0	0
Total Cases	18	90	2	10	0	0

Explanation

This is a **“Strength” for Georgetown DSS**. This item asks two questions: 1) Were the needs of the child, parents, and foster parents assessed, and 2) Did the agency take steps to meet the identified needs?

In 100% of the foster care cases, workers did assess or address the needs of the children and foster parents. In two of the ten applicable treatment cases, the practice most identified as needing improvement was the need for more thorough assessments on all appropriate family members and following up on the needs of the grandparent who had physical custody of the children.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Well Being Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	60	4	40	0	0
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	0
Total Cases	11	55	9	45	0	0

Explanation

This is an “**Area Needing Improvement**” for **Georgetown DSS**. Workers were more likely to involve children and parents in foster care cases in case planning than children and parents in treatment cases. In two foster care cases, the process of involving the parent and child in the case planning process was not documented. The onsite reviewers found minimum documentation supporting family meetings occurring in either treatment and foster care cases. In other treatment cases, the practice most identified as needing improvement was the need for more thorough assessments on all appropriate family members to include the caretakers and the need to include them in the development of the treatment plans.

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Well Being Item 19: Worker visits with child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	10	100	0	0	0	0
Total Cases	20	100	0	0	0	0

Explanation

This is a “**Strength**” for **Georgetown DSS**. This rating is based on two questions: 1) were Georgetown DSS staff visiting children according to policy, and 2) did the visits focus on issues related to the treatment plan? All twenty applicable cases in foster care and treatment rated a “Strength” because the children were seen monthly and the focus of those visits were on treatment planning related issues.

Stakeholder comment:

“The case workers do a good job of providing face-to-face visits once a month and needs are adequately assessed.”

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

<u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Well Being Item 20: Worker visits with parent(s)						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	60	2	8	2	0
Treatment	10	100	0	0	0	0
Total Cases	16	89	2	11	2	0

Explanation

This is a **“Strength” for Georgetown DSS**. The review found that item 20 is a weak area in foster care not in treatment for Georgetown County. In 60 percent of the foster care cases reviewed, in which items were applicable, visitation between the worker and the parents were occurring monthly. In 100 % of the treatment cases reviewed, there were monthly contacts made with the family during the period under review. In those cases the documentation supports whether the fathers were seen, or the agency’s attempts to engage him, or the agency’s attempts to locate him. The two foster care cases rated an Area Needing Improvement because the face-to-face contacts with the mother were sporadic and the case record contained no letters of correspondence being sent to the mother as an attempt by the agency to engage the mother in visiting with her child and participating in the case planning process.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Section Six

Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

Summary of Findings

Overall Finding:

-Item 21: Educational needs of the child

Substantially Achieved

Finding: Strength

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings

Well Being Item 21: Educational needs of child

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	100	0	0	5	0
Treatment	6	86	1	14	3	0
Total Cases	11	92	1	8	8	0

Explanation

This is a “**Strength**” for Georgetown DSS. The review found that the children’s educational needs in both treatment and foster care cases were adequately attended to with the exception of one treatment case. In that case, the child’s educational need was assessed initially; current documentation does not support the ongoing assessment of the child’s educational needs, to include an updated IEP.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Section Seven

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

Summary of Findings

Overall Finding:

- Item 22: Physical health of the child
- Item 23: Mental health of the child

Substantially Achieved

Finding: Strength

Finding: Strength

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings

Well Being Item 22: Physical health of the child

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	0
Treatment	8	100	0	0	2	0
Total Cases	17	94	1	6	2	0

Explanation

This is a **“Strength” for Georgetown DSS**. In treatment, 100% of the children’s medical needs were adequately assessed. In foster care, 90 % of the children’s medical needs were adequately assessed. The foster care case rated “Area Needing Improvement” contained no follow up assessment for the child’s dental care.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

<u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Well Being Item 23: Mental health of the child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	83	1	17	4	0
Treatment	3	100	0	0	7	0
Total Cases	8	89	1	11	11	0

Explanation

This is a **“Strength” for Georgetown DSS**. The review found that initial screenings and psychological evaluations were provided to 83% of the foster children and that those children mental health services appropriately addressed their needs. In the three applicable treatment cases, the review found that the mental health needs of the children were adequately assessed. In one foster care case, there were deficiencies where case documentation identifies a need for counseling due to the child’s behavior of lying, stealing and sexual abuse issues. Onsite reviewer found no follow-up by the agency to address those needs.

Section Eight – Foster Home Licenses

This is a **“Strength” for Georgetown DSS**. Ten of the open foster home records were reviewed. All of the licenses were up-to-date and the information was filed correctly. The documents were easy to locate. Foster home regulations are being followed. The documentation was excellent and no deficiencies were noted.

Strengths

1. All licenses were renewed prior to expiration.
2. All re-licensing, initial licensing, and amended license information on file.
3. Foster Home Quarterly Home visit Guides on file. Visits held timely and documented in CAPSS.
4. CAPSS information current and up to date.
5. Training hours completed and documented in the case files.
6. Please direct all staff to insure placements is updated in CAPSS when children enter and exit foster care.
7. No deficiencies noted

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Section Nine – Unfounded Investigations

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Investigation initiated timely?	4	1
Was assessment adequate?	5	0
Was decision appropriate?	5	0

This is "Strength" for Georgetown County DSS. The review team determined that all five unfounded investigations reviewed had an adequate assessment during the investigation and it appeared that the decision to unfound the report was appropriate. The initial contact was not made timely in one of the five investigations. In that case, the reviewer noted that the response time assigned was 2-12 hours. According to the dictation, the initial contact was made in 24 hours.

Section Ten – Screened Out Intakes

	Yes	No	Cannot Determine
Was Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	7	2	1
	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?	1	0	9
Were Appropriate Referrals Made?	0	1	9

This is an "Area Needing Improvement" for Georgetown County DSS. Two screened-out referrals should have been accepted based on the history of CPS and the mother's inability to care for the child; due to her drug abuse. As a result, the child was placed with relatives and the agency closed the case. The recent allegation alleges that the mother is caring for the child again and she hangs out all night. The other screened-out should have been pended to verify at what point the child will be release from DJJ and return home since the allegations of physical abuse was reported to the agency prior to the child being placed at DJJ.

**Georgetown County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
August 2006**

Case Rating Summary

The performance and outcome ratings below show the number of cases receiving that rating, followed by the percent of the total that number represents. Not Applicable (N/A) cases do not factor in the percentage.

Performance Item or Outcome	Perf. Item Ratings			Outcome Ratings			
	Strength	Area Needing Improvement	N/A*	Substantially Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved	N/A*
Outcome S1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.				18 (90%)	2(10%)		3
Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	6 (100%)	0	14				
Item 2: Repeat maltreatment	17 (89%)	2 (11%)	1				
Outcome S2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.				17 (85%)	2 (10%)	1(5%)	0
Item 3: Services to family to protect child (ren) in home and prevent removal	9 (82%)	2(18%)	9				
Item 4: Risk of harm to child (ren)	18 (90%)	2 (10%)	0				
Outcome P1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.				6 (60%)	2 (20%)	2(20%)	0
Item 5: Foster care re-entries	3 (100%)	0	7				
Item 6: Stability of foster care placement	10 (100%)	0	0				
Item 7: Permanency goal for child	8 (80%)	2(20%)	0				
Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	4 (100%)	0	6				
Item 9: Adoption	1(20%)	4(80%)	5				
Item 10: Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement	1 (100%)	0	9				
Outcome P2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.				90 (90%)	1(10%)	0	0
Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement	8 (100%)	0	2				
Item 12: Placement with siblings	6 (100%)	0	4				
Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	7 (78%)	2(22%)	1				
Item 14: Preserving connections	8 (89%)	1(11%)	1				
Item 15: Relative placement	5 (56%)	4 (44%)	1				
Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents	5 (83%)	1(17%)	8				
Outcome WB1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.				16 (80%)	4 (20%)	0	0
Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents	18 (90%)	2(10%)	0				
Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning	11 (55%)	9 (45%)	0				
Item 19: Worker visits with child	20 (100%)	0	0				
Item 20: Worker visits with parent(s)	16 (89%)	2 (11%)	2				
Outcome WB2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.				11 (92%)	1 (8%)	0	8
Item 21: Educational needs of the child	11 (92%)	1 (8%)	8				
Outcome WB3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.				17 (94%)	0	1 (6%)	2
Item 22: Physical health of the child	17 (94%)	1 (6%)	0				
Item 23: Mental health of the child	8 (89%)	1 (11)	11				