During the week of January 22-26, 2007 a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Oconee 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, Oconee DSS supervisors, and representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

Period included in Case Record Review: July 1, 2006 to December 31, 2006 Period included in Outcome Measures: January 1, 2006 to December 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 (§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.

#### **Ratings**

The standard that must be met for all items reviewed onsite is 90%. Each outcome report has its own standard. To be rated an area of **Strength** most items must meet both the qualitative onsite review standard **and** the quantitative outcome report standard.

# **Section One**

Outcome S1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.

#### **Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

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

Data Time Period: 01/01/06 to 12/31/06

\*Objective: 100% in <= 24 hours

	Number of	Number of	Percent of	Number of					
	Reports	Investigations	Investigations	Investigations					
	Accepted	Initiated Timely	Initiated Timely	Above (Below)					
	_	-	-	Objective					
State	16,324	15,636	95.8%	-686					
Dillon	162	162	100.0%	0					

<sup>\*</sup>This standard is based on state law. It is not a federally established objective.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings									
Safety Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment.									
	Area Needing								
	Stre	Strength Improvement			Not	t Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	2	100	0	0	8	0			
Treatment	0	0	0	0	10	0			
Total Cases	2	100	0	0	18				

#### **Explanation of Item 1**

This is an area of **Strength** for Dillon DSS. The outcome report shows that the county initiated all investigations within the mandated 24 hours. The onsite review findings are consistent with the outcome measure report. All of the CPS investigations in the treatment and foster care cases were initiated within the required timeframes and within the timeframes judged to be appropriate by the risk rating assigned to the intake by the county.

Stakeholder Comments: "DSS is responsive and timely in initiating investigations."

## **Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

**Measure S1.2: Recurrence of Maltreatment --** Of all the 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 January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2006

\*Objective: <=6.1%

	Number of Child	Number of	Percent of	Number of					
	Victims	Children in	Children in	Children Above					
		Another Founded	Another Founded	(Below)					
		Rept	Rept	Objective					
State	10137	57	0.56%	561.36					
Dillon	129	0	0.00%	7.87					

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

#### **Explanation of Item 2**

This is an area of **Strength** for Dillon DSS. All of the CPS treatment and foster care cases were rated strength for item two. There was no repeat maltreatment. Both the outcome report and onsite review shows no incidence of repeat maltreatment.

**Stakeholder Comments:** "DSS is very responsive; she can't recall a single time she called and they didn't respond. The staff is well informed in identifying risk factors. They do try to prevent recurrence."

## **Section Two**

Outcome S2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings									
Safety Item 3: Services to family to protect child (ren) in home and prevent removal									
Area Needing									
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	1	50	1	50	8	0			
Treatment	9	90	1	10	0	0			
Total Cases	10	83	2	17	8	0			

Explanation of Item 3
This is an Area Needing Improvement for Dillon DSS. In Item three, nine out of the 10 treatment cases reviewed were rated strength. The one case in treatment rated an area needing improvement was due to the agency not following up on making the appropriate referrals for services to address the ongoing safety needs of the children and family. In foster care, one case was rated area needing improvement for item three. In that case, onsite reviewers found no supporting documentation in the case record of services being provided to the children left in the home.

#### **Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

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.

\* Objective: <=8.5%

	Number of	Number With	Percent of	Number of Cases
	Alleged Child	Another Rept	Alleged Victims	Above (Below)
	Victims after	Within 6 months	within 6 months	Objective
	Unfounded	of Unfounded	of the Unfounded	
	Reports 07/01/05	Determination	Determination	
	to 06/30/06			
State	14,298	1,039	7.27%	176.3
Dillon	128	12	9.38%	-1.1

<sup>\*</sup>This is a DSS established objective.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings  Safety Item 4: Risk of harm.										
Area Needing Strength Improvement Not Applicable										
	#	%	#	%	#	%				
	1.0	100								
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0					
Treatment	9	90	1	10	0					
Total Cases	19	95	1	5	0					

#### **Explanation of Item 4**

This is an area of **Strength** for Dillon DSS. According to the outcome report, the county fell short of the agency standard by one percentage point. However, the onsite review found that risk of harm was reduced in 95% of the treatment and foster care cases reviewed.

**Stakeholder Comments:** "DSS refers out appropriately, and works well with families. The staff is well informed in identifying risk factors. They do try to prevent recurrence. She does believe that DSS reduces risk of harm to children."

# **Section Three**

Outcome P1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

#### **Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

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

\* Objective: <=8.6%

	Number of	Number That	Percent Entering	Number of
	Children entering	Were Returned	Care After	Children Above
	care 01/01/06 to	Home Within	Returning Home	(Below)
	12/31/06	The Past 12	Within The Past	Objective
		Months From	12 Months from	
		Previous Foster	Previous FC	
		Care Episode	Episode	
State	3,462	272	7.86%	25.7
Dillon	51	8	15.69%	-3.6

<sup>\*</sup>This is a federally established objective.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings										
Safety Item 5: Foster care re-entries.										
	Area Needing									
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not	t Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%				
Foster Care	0	0	0	0	10	0				

#### **Explanation of Item 5**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon DSS. All of the foster care cases in the sample were excluded from a rating for this item because the children entered care prior to the period under review. However, the outcome measure report shows that eight of the 51 children re-entered foster care within the past 12 months from a previous foster care episode. Consequently, Item 5 is an area needing improvement for Dillon.

#### **Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

**Measure P3.2: Stability of Foster Care Placement --** Of all the children who have been in foster care less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home, the percent that had more than 2 placement settings.

\* Objective: >=86.7%

	Number of	Number of	Percent of	Number of
	Children in Care	Children with No	Children with No	Children Above
	Less Than 12	More than 2	More than Two	(Below)
	Months	Placements	Placements	Objective
State	3,930	3164	80.51%	-243.3
Dillon	52	43	82.69%	-3.6

<sup>\*</sup>This is a federally established objective.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings									
Safety Item 6: Stability of foster care placement.									
	Area Needing								
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not	t Applicable			
	#	%	#	#	%				
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0			

#### **Explanation of Item 6**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon DSS. The outcome report shows that 43 of the 52 children in care less than 12 months had less than two foster care placements. Therefore, the county failed to meet this federally established objective. Onsite reviewers looked at all children in care, not just those in care less than 12 months. Eighty percent of the cases reviewed were rated as strength. The two cases rated an area needing improvement were children with conduct and emotional disorders and were continuing to disrupt placements. Both children were under the care of Managed Treatment Services (MTS).

## **Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

**Measure P1.5: Permanency Goal for Child --** Of all the children who have been in foster care for 15 of the most 22 months, the percent for which a Termination of Parental Rights (TPR) petition has been filed.

\*Objective: >=53%

J	Children in Care	Number of	Percent of	Number of
	At Least 15 of	Children with	Children with	Children Above
	Last 22 Months	TPR Compliant	TPR Compliant	(Below)
	01/01/06 to	_	_	Objective
	12/31/06			_
State	3,624	1631	45.0%	-289.7
Dillon	40	29	72.5%	7.8

<sup>\*</sup>This is a federally established objective.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings									
Safety Item 7: Permanency goal for children.									
	Area Needing								
	Strength Improvement Not Applicable								
# % # % # %									
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0				

#### **Explanation of Item 7**

This is an area of **Strength** for Dillon DSS. To meet the criteria established in the CAPSS report 53% or more of the children in care 15 of the most recent 22 months must have a TPR petition filed. The outcome report shows that TPR petitions were filed on 72.5% of the children in foster care. Onsite reviewers found that the permanency goals in the cases reviewed were appropriate. Both the outcome report and the onsite review shows that Dillon County does a very good job in establishing the permanency goal for the children in foster care.

**Stakeholder Comments:** "The agency is good at determining permanency goals; the agency meets deadlines and follows the rules to the letter. Agency is pretty good at helping children in care return home safely."

#### **Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

**Measure P1.3: Length of Time to Achieve Reunification --** Of all the 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.

\*Objective>=76.2%

O S J C C C T C C	/ / / / / /			
	Number of Children	Number of Children	Percent of Children	Number of
	Returned to	Returned to	Returned to	Children
	Parent(s)/Caretaker(s)	Parent(s)/Caretaker(s)	Parent(s)/Caretaker(s)	Above
	home 01/01/06 to	after in < Than 12	after in Care <12	(Below)
	12/31/06	Months	Months	Objective
State	2,130	1,731	81.27%	107.9
Dillon	20	17	85.00%	1.8

<sup>\*</sup>This is a federally established objective.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings									
Safety Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives.									
	Area Needing								
	Strength Improvement Not Applicable								
# % # % # %									
Foster Care	3	75	1	25	6	0			

#### **Explanation of Item 8**

This is an area of **Strength** for Dillon DSS. According to the outcome data 85% of the children who entered foster care returned home within 12 months of entering care. Onsite reviewers determined that most children with the plan of reunification had an appropriate permanency plan. One case rated an area needing improvement because the agency's plan to return a child to his grandmother was inappropriate.

## **Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

**Measure P1.4: Length of Time to Achieve Adoption --** Of all the 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.

\*Objective: >=32%

o »jeeti, to re e z	Number of	Number of	Percent of	Number of
	Children Whose	Children Whose	Children Whose	Children Above
	Adoption Was	Adoption was	Adoption Was	(Below)
	Finalized during	Finalized < 24	Finalized in < 24	Objective
	01/01/06-	Months of	Months.	-
	12/31/06	Entering Care		
State	405	61	15.1%	-68.6
Dillon	6	3	50.0%	1.1

<sup>\*</sup>This is a federally established objective.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings									
Safety Item 9: Adoption.									
Area Needing									
	Strength Improvement Not Applicable								
# % # % # %									
Foster Care	1	33	2	67	7				

#### **Explanation of Item 9**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon DSS. The outcome report shows half of the finalized adoptions were completed within 24 months of the child entering care, compared to the federal standard of 32%. The outcome report only captures completed adoptions. The onsite review measures children with a plan of adoption. Two cases were rated an area needing improvement because the children with the plan of Adoption had already been in foster care for two or more years. TPR pleadings were filed timely in both cases. In one case, the judge granted TPR action against the mother and ordered the agency to continue to provide treatment services to the father. In the other case, the TPR action was completed in July 2003 and the child was still awaiting adoption.

**Stakeholder Comments**: "She has kids who have had a permanency plan for adoption for years and also kids called unadoptable. Some babies haven't been adopted within 24 months."

#### **Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

Measure P1.6: Permanency Goal of "Other Planned Living Arrangement" – Of all the children in foster care, the percent with a permanency goal of emancipation (Indep Living Services) or a planned permanent living arrangement other than adoption, guardianship, or return to family.

\*Objective: <=15%

•				
	Number of	Number of	Percent of	Number of
	Children in Care	Children with	Children with	Children Above
	at Least One Day	Permanency Plan	Permanency Plan	(Below)
	01/01/06 to	of Other Planned	of Other Planned	Objective
	12/31/06	Living	Living	
		Arrangement	Arrangement	
State	8,416	1524	18.1%	-261.6
Dillon	81	10	12.4%	2.2

<sup>\*</sup>This is a DSS established objective.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings									
Safety Item 10: Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement.									
Area Needing									
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not	t Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	1	1 100 0 0 9							
Total Cases	1	100	0	0	9				

#### **Explanation of Item 10**

This is an area of **Strength** for Dillon DSS. The standard for this objective is that no more than 15% of the children in foster care should have this plan – Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA). The outcome data shows ten of the (12.4%) children in Dillon custody had this plan. One foster care case reviewed onsite had APPLA as a permanency plan. In that case, the plan was appropriate and the child was receiving independent living services as required by policy.

## **Section Four**

Outcome P2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

#### **Strategic Outcome Report Findings**

**Measure P2.1: 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.

\*Objective: >=70%

· ·	Number of	Number of	Percent of	Number of
	Children in Care	Children in Care   Children Placed		Children Above
	01/01/06 to	within County of	within County of	(Below)
	12/31/06	Origin	Origin	Objective
State	6,304	3,887	61.7%	-525.8
Dillon	81	44	54.3%	-12.7

<sup>\*</sup>This is a DSS established objective.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings									
Safety Item 11:	Proximity	of foster	care placeme	nt.					
Area Needing									
	Strength Improvement Not Applicable								
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care 5 100 0 0 5 0									
Total Cases	5	100	0	0	5	0			

#### **Explanation of Item 11**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon DSS. According to the outcome report 44 of 81 (54.3%) foster children were placed within the county. To meet the standard for this item at least 70% must be placed within the county. Onsite reviewers determined that some children placed outside of the county were in adjacent counties and relatively close to their home communities. Other children were placed outside of the county due to their need for therapeutic placement. Even with those considerations, having 46% of the children placed out-of-county makes this an area needing improvement.

**Stakeholder Comments:** "Most kids in care stay in county unless they need specialized care."

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings								
Safety Item 12: Placement with siblings.								
	Area Needing							
	Strength Improvement Not Applicable							
# % # % # %								
Foster Care	5	83	1	17	4	0		

#### **Explanation of Item 12**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon. Sibling groups were placed together in 83% of the foster care cases reviewed. One case rated an area needing improvement because a sibling group of three children were in separate placements, and their separation was not in the children's best interest.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings							
Safety Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care.							
			Area N	leeding			
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not	Applicable	
# % # % # %							
Foster Care	5	71	2	29	3	0	

#### **Explanation of Item 13**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon. In most (71%) instances the agency did an excellent job of arranging for visits between children in foster care and their parents and with siblings placed in another setting. However, two cases rated an area needing improvement because visits with both parents and the other siblings in foster care were not occurring. The agency did not adequately document its attempts to involve the fathers in visitation plans.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings								
Safety Item 14: Preserving connections.								
			Area N	leeding				
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not	Applicable		
# % # % # %								
Foster Care	7	100	0	0	3			

#### **Explanation of Item 14**

This is an area of **Strength** for Dillon DSS. This item addresses the agency's ability to preserve a child in foster care's connection to the people, places and things that are important to him. All seven of the applicable foster care cases were rated an area of strength for Item 14. Reviewers saw evidence of children maintaining contact with grandparents and other relatives. Whenever possible children were kept in the same schools and were placed close to their home communities.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings									
Safety Item 15: Relative placement.									
	Area Needing								
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not	Applicable			
	# % # % # %								
Foster Care	6	75	2	25	2	2			

#### **Explanation of Item 15**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon. This item addresses the agency's effectiveness in identifying and assessing the relatives of children in foster care as possible caregivers. In 75% 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 25% of the foster care cases reviewed, there was no indication that paternal relatives were assessed as placement resources.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings								
Safety Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents.								
			Area N	leeding				
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not	Applicable		
# % # % # %								
Foster Care	1	33	2	67	7	0		

#### **Explanation of Item 16**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon DSS. This item addresses the agency's effectiveness in promoting or maintaining a strong emotionally supportive relationship between children in care and their parents. One case was rated an area of strength for this item because the agency arranged visits between the child and both parents, even though the father was in prison in another county. Two cases were rated an area needing improvement because the agency did not adequately make provision for the children to maintain their relationships with both parents.

## **Section Five**

Outcome WB1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings										
Well Being Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents.										
Area Needing										
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not	t Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%				
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0				
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	0				
Total Cases	13	65	7	35	0	0				

#### **Explanation of Item 17**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon 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? This measure was rated Strength in 80% of the foster care cases and in 50% of the treatment cases reviewed. The practice most identified as needing improvement was the need for more thorough assessment and involvement of the fathers; especially when they are identified as a potential placement source.

**Stakeholder Comments:** "Some families are more responsive than others in accepting services, and in putting services to good use. Like most small counties, Dillon County has limited resources and transportation is really a problem."

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings										
Well Being Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning.										
Area Needing										
	Strength Improvement Not Applicable									
	#	%	#	%	#	%				
Foster Care	6	67	3	33	1	0				
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	0				
Total Cases	11	58	8	42	1	0				

#### **Explanation of Item 18**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon DSS. Involving parents and age-appropriate children in the case planning process is not a consistent practice in Dillon DSS. It appears that caseworkers sometimes write the case plans then ask parents to sign the plans. Not all case plans were signed, so it could not be determined if the parent had a copy of their plan or knew exactly what was required of them.

Stakeholder Comments: "DSS does not follow up with fathers enough."

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings									
Well Being Item 19: Worker visits with child(ren).									
Area Needing									
	Stre	ngth	Improv	Not	Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0			
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0	0			
Total Cases	17	85	3	15	0	0			

#### **Explanation of Item 19**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon DSS. Children in foster care are being seen at least once each month. In some cases they were seen more than once a month. Most, but not all children in treatment cases were seen monthly. Treatment cases with several siblings were more likely to be rated area needing improvement when some but not all children were seen.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings									
Well Being Item 20: Worker visits with parent(s).									
Area Needing									
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	4	67	2	33	4				
Treatment	4	40	6	60	0				
Total Cases	8	50	8	50	4				

#### **Explanation of Item 20**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon DSS. Onsite reviewers determined that in 33% of the foster care and in 60% of the treatment cases reviewed, monthly visits were not occurring consistently with both parents. Workers often concentrated their efforts and visits on the mothers, and not the fathers.

## **Section Six**

Outcome WB2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings										
Well Being Item 21: Educational needs of child										
			Area N	leeding						
	Stre	ngth	Impro	vement	Not	Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%				
Foster Care	6	86	1	14	3					
Treatment	6	86	1	14	3					
Total Cases	12	86	2	14	6					

#### **Explanation of Item 21**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon DSS. The review found that educational needs were adequately assessed in 86% of the treatment and foster care cases. One treatment case was rated an area needing improvement because the agency failed to make the appropriate referrals for services to address the child's behavioral problems and poor school performance. One foster care case was rated an area needing improvement because the information in the worker's assessment was inconsistent with the school records and behavioral reports. For instance, the school report indicated that the child was exhibiting behavioral problems. The assessment in the case record stated that the child had no behavioral problems. The school recommended that the child be evaluated. The agency did not ensure that the evaluation was done.

## **Section Seven**

Outcome WB3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings										
Well Being Item 22: Physical health of the child.										
Area Needing										
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not	Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%				
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0				
Treatment	6	6 60 4 40 0 0								
Total Cases	16	80	4	20	0	0				

#### **Explanation of Item 22**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon DSS. The physical health needs of all children in foster care appear to be well met. Two problems were identified in treatment cases rated area needing improvement. The medical needs of some children were not assessed. For others, needs were identified, but not addressed.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings									
Well Being Item 23: Mental health of the child.									
Area Needing									
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	7	100	0	0	3	0			
Treatment	5 71 2 29 3 0								
Total Cases	12	86	2	14	6	0			

#### **Explanation of Item 23**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon DSS. All of the foster care cases reviewed were rated strength for Item 23. In 29 % of the treatment cases reviewed, the children's mental health needs were not assessed. In those cases, the children had been exposed to severe domestic violence but were not referred for a mental health assessment.

# **Section Eight – Foster Home Licenses**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Dillon DSS. Eight out of the 10 licensing records reviewed properly documented that licensing requirements were being met by those foster homes. Training licensing hours were well documented. Record checks are being conducted on the foster parents for renewals. The majority of the cases were getting timely fire inspections. The three problems most often cited were 1) lack of record checks on all adult household members, 2) sexual offender checks on all household members age 12 and older and, 3) all adult household members not present during the quarterly visits.

# **Section -- Unfounded Investigations**

	Yes	No
Investigation initiated timely?	5	
Was assessment adequate?	5	
Was decision appropriate?	5	

This is an area of **Strength** for Dillon DSS. All five of the assessments were adequate. The decision to unfound the case in all five of the investigations was supported by the available evidence.

## **Section Ten -- Screened Out Intakes**

Was Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	Yes 9	<b>No</b> 1	<b>Cannot Determine</b>
	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?	2	1	7
Were Appropriate Referrals Made?			10

This is an area of **Strength** for Dillon DSS. Nine of the Intakes reviewed were appropriately screened out because the reports did not describe threats to children that met the definition of abuse or neglect. One screened out intake should have been accepted for investigation. That intake described a specific allegation of maltreatment of a one month old baby getting burned by hot beans as a result of domestic violence between the mother and her paramour.

Also, the review found that Dillon County does a good job in documenting the justification for screening out reports and inputting the documentation into CAPSS.

	Onsite Review Rating Summary								
		Perform	nance Item Ratings						
	Performance Item or Outcome	Strength	Area Needing Improvement	N/A*					
	Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost,	protected from abus	e and neglect.						
Item 1:	Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	2/2 = 100%	0	18					
Item 2:	Repeat maltreatment	19/19 = 100%		1					
S	afety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their h	omes whenever pos	sible and appropriate.	•					
Item 3:	Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	10/12 = 83%	2/12=17%	8					
Item 4:	Risk of harm to child(ren)	19/20 = 95%	1/20 = 5%	0					
	Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency a	nd stability in their l	iving situations.						
Item 5:	Foster care re-entries			10					
Item 6:	Stability of foster care placement	8/10 = 80%	2/10=20%	0					
Item 7:	Permanency goal for child	9/10 = 100%	1/10=10%	0					
Item 8:	Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	3/4 = 75%	1/4=25%	6					
Item 9:	Adoption	1/3 = 33%	2/3 = 67%	7					
Item 10:	Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	3/3 = 100%	0	7					
Per	manency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationship		preserved for children	1.					
Item 11:	Proximity of foster care placement	5/5 = 100%	0	5					
Item 12:	Placement with siblings	5/6 = 84%	1/6=16%0	4					
Item 13:	Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	5/7 = 71%	2/7 = 29%	3					
Item 14:	Preserving connections	7/7 = 100%	0	3					
Item 15:	Relative placement	6/8 = 75%	2/8 = 25%	2					
Item 16:	Relationship of child in care with parents	1/3 = 33%	2/3 = 67%	7					
	Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacit	y to provide for their	r children's needs.	,					
Item 17:	Needs and services of child, parents, caregiver	13/20 = 65%	7/20 =35%	0					
Item 18:	Child and family involvement in case planning	11/19 = 58%	8/19 = 42%	1					
Item 19:	Worker visits with child	17/20 = 85%	3/20 = 15	0					
Item 20:	Worker visits with parent(s)	8/16 = 50%	8/16 = 50%	4					
	Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate se	rvices to meet their	educational needs.						
Item 21:	Educational needs of the child	12/14 = 86%	2/14=14%	6					
Wel	l Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to	meet their physical	and mental health need	ls.					
Item 22:	Physical health of the child	16/20 = 80%	4/20 = 20%	0					
Item 23:	Mental health of the child	12/14 = 86%	2/14=14%	6					