During the week of November 17 -21, 2008, a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Calhoun 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, Calhoun DSS supervisors, and representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

Period under Review: November 1, 2007 to October 31, 2008 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 95%. 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.

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

The county's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of two items:

1) Timeliness of initiating investigations

Strength

2) Repeat Maltreatment

Strength

Agency Data										
Performance Measure 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations on Reports of Child										
Maltreatment		_	_							
Objective: 100%	in <= 24 hours (state	e law)								
	Number of	Number of	Percent of	Numbers of						
	Determinations	Investigations	Investigations	Investigations						
		Initiated Timely	Initiated Timely	Above						
			•	(Below)						
				Objective						
State	18,570	18,002	96.94%	(568)						
Calhoun	363	363	100%	0						

Explanation of Item 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations

This is an area of **Strength** for Calhoun DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all (100%) accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. Agency data indicates that for the 12 month period under review, Calhoun initiated all 41 of its investigations of alleged abuse and neglect within 24 hours. Reviewers determined that the agency was appropriately assigning risk ratings to investigations.

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

Explanation of Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment

This is an area of **Strength** for Calhoun DSS. This item measures the occurrence of maltreatment among children under agency supervision. Agency data shows that 96% of the treatment cases closed were not involved in a subsequent indicated incident of maltreatment. Looking at foster care and treatment cases, reviewers determined that none of the children under agency supervision experienced additional maltreatment.

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

The county's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of two items:

- 3) Services to family to protect children and prevent removal
- 4) Risk of Harm

Area Needing Improvement

Strength

Onsite Review Findings									
Safety Item 3: Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in Home and Prevent Removal									
	Area Needing								
	Stre	ngth	Improvement		Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	1	100	0	0	9	0			
Treatment	10	100	0	0	0	0			
Total Cases	11	100	0	0	9	0			

Explanation of Item 3: Services to Family to Protect Children and Prevent Removal

This is an area of **Strength** for Calhoun DSS. This item assesses whether services were adequate to protect children in their home and prevent their removal and placement into foster care. In 100% of the foster care cases, reviewers determined that the decision to remove the children from their homes and place them in foster care was appropriate. Also in 100% of the treatment cases reviewed, appropriate services were being offered to safely maintain the children in their home.

Onsite Review Findings Safety Item 4: Risk of Harm									
	Strength			leeding vement	Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	0			
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0	0			
Total Cases	16	80	4	20	0	0			

Explanation of Item 4: Risk of Harm

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Calhoun DSS. This item assesses whether the agency's intervention reduced risks of harm to children. In 90% of the foster care cases reviewed, risk of harm was adequately managed. Reviewers rated 30% of the in-home treatment cases as needing improvement. In those cases, risk of harm to children in the home was not properly managed because the agency failed to complete criminal background checks on other adults in the home or on alternate caregivers.

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

The county's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of six items:

5)	Foster care re-entries	Strength
6)	Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement
7)	Permanency goal for child	Strength
8)	Reunification or permanent placement with relatives	Area Needing Improvement
9)	Adoption	Area Needing Improvement
10)	Permanency goal of Alternate Planned	
	Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	Strength

Agency Data

Performance Measure 7: Foster Care Re-entries – Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification in the 12 month period prior to the reporting period, the percent that did not reenter foster care within 12 months of the date of their discharge.

Objective: ≥ 90.1% (National 25th percentile) **Report Period:** July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008

Report Period	Report Period: July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008								
	Number Children	Number of	Percent of Children	Number of					
	Reunified During	Children	Discharged Who	Children					
	Reporting Period	Discharged Who	Did Not Re-enter	Above					
		Did Not Re-enter	Foster Care	(Below)					
		Foster Care		Objective					
State	2,591	2,406	92.86%	71.5					
Calhoun	34	34	100%	3.4					

Explanation of Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries

This is an area of **Strength** for Calhoun DSS. This item measures the frequency of children reentering foster care within a year of discharge. To meet the objective for this item 90.1% of children must not re-enter foster care within a year of discharge. Agency data shows that none of the children returned home during the previous 12 months re-entered foster care.

Agency Data

Performance Measure 6: Stability of Foster Care Placements – Of all children who had been in foster care at least 8 days but less than 12 months from the time of latest removal from home, the percentage that had no more than two placement settings.

Objective: >= 86.0% (federal standard)

Objective: >= 00.070 (redefti standard)								
	Foster Care Services	Number with	Percent with	Number				
	Open >7 days and <	No More than 2	No More than 2	Above				
	12 months	placements	placements	(Below)				
				Objective				
State	3,987	2,910	72.99%	(307.5)				
Calhoun	49	35	71.43%	(4.5)				

Explanation of Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Calhoun DSS. This item measures the frequency of placement changes for children in foster care, and assesses the reasons for those changes. The objective is that at least 86% of the children in care have two or fewer placements within 12 months. Agency data shows that 71.43% of Calhoun children had two or fewer placements. The county does not have enough foster parents who are willing to accept the type of children entering care.

Onsite Review Findings									
Permanency Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child									
			Area Ne	eeding					
	Strength		Improvement		Not App	licable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0			

Explanation of Item 7: Permanency Goal for Children

This is an area of **Strength** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness of permanency goals for children in foster care and the timeliness of those permanency decisions. Reviewers determined that in every foster care case, the agency quickly identified the appropriate goal.

Agency Data

Performance Measure 8: **Time to Achieve Reunification** – Of all children who were reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of discharge from foster care and had been in care for 8 days or more, what percentage were reunified in less than 12 months from the date of their latest removal from home?

Temovar from nome:								
Objective: >= 75.2% (federal standard)								
	Number of Children	Number of						
	Returned to	Returned to	Returned to	Children				
	Parents/Caretakers	Parents/Caretakers	ents/Caretakers Parents/Caretakers					
		after in Care <12	after in Care < 12	(Below)				
		months	months	Objective				
State	2,506	1,933	77.13%	48.5				
Calhoun	47	21	44.68%	(14.3)				

Explanation of Item 8: Reunification or Permanent Placement with Relatives

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the activities and processes necessary to accomplish the goal of reunification with caregivers or placement with relatives. Agency data shows that 44.68% of children who entered foster care in Calhoun County returned home within a year. This performance failed to meet the federal standard of 75.2%.

Agency Data

Performance Measure 9: Time to Finalized Adoption – Of all children who left foster care due to finalized adoption during the reporting year, what percentage left foster care within 24 months from the date of their latest removal from home?

Objective: >= 36.6% (National 75th percentile) **Report Period:** July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008

Report Teriod: July 1, 2007 Julie 30, 2000								
	Number of	Number of Adoptions	Percent of Adoptions	Number of				
	Adoptions	Finalized in < 24	Finalized in	Adoptions				
	Finalized	months	< 24 Months	Above				
				(Below)				
				Objective				
State	515	100	19.42%	(88.5)				
Calhoun	18	3	16.67%	(3.6)				

Onsite Review Findings									
Permanency Item 9: Adoption									
			Area Ne	eeding					
	Strength		Improvement		Not A	Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	0	0	4	100	6	0			

Explanation of Item 9: Adoption

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the process within the child welfare system to achieve timely adoptions for children in foster care. Agency data indicates that only three adoptions have been completed in Calhoun County in over three years, and those were completed during the past 12 months. Reviewers looked at the cases of four children with the plan of adoption. All had been in care more than two years. Reviewers saw continuances in the merit and permanency planning hearings which contributed to permanency delays.

Stakeholder Comments: "There were some problems with the attorney/paralegal in the past and there were a lot of changes that slowed down the process for obtaining permanency. These changes caused court orders to not be filed timely and a lot of continuances were present."

Onsite Review Findings

Permanency Item 10: Permanency Goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)

	Area Needing					
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	100	0	0	8	0

Explanation of Item 10: Permanency Goal of APPLA

This is an area of **Strength** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness and effectiveness of services provided to children with the permanency plan of APPLA. Reviewers also rate whether the agency attempted to locate and reassess relatives or non-relatives that were willing to commit to the youth's long-term care every six months. Reviewers found that in each case, youth with the plan of APPLA were receiving appropriate Independent Living services. Reviewers also found that the youth were living with foster parents who were committed to their long term care.

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

This outcome is based on the rating of 6 items:

16) Relationship of child in care with parents

11) Proximity of foster care placement
 12) Placement with siblings in foster care
 13) Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care
 14) Preserving connections
 15) Relative placement
 16 Strength
 17 Area Needing Improvement
 18 Area Needing Improvement
 19 Area Needing Improvement

Area Needing Improvement

Agency Data

Performance Measure 13: Foster Children Placed Within County of Origin – Of all children in foster care during the reporting period (excluding MTS and Adoptions children), what percentage are placed within their county of origin.

Objective: >=70% (Agency Standard)									
	Number of	Number of	Percent of	Number of					
	Children in Care	Children Placed	Children Placed	Children Above					
	08/03/07 -	Within County of	Within County of	(Below)					
	08/02/08	Origin	Origin	Objective					
State	6,264	4,172	66.60%	(212.8)					
Calhoun	98	75	76.53%	4.0					

Onsite Review Findings								
Permanency Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement								
	Area Needing							
	Stren	gth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	plicable		
	# % # % # %							
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0		

Explanation of Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement

This is an area of **Strength** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep children close enough to their families so that essential relationships can be maintained. One measure used to evaluate this item is the percentage of children who are placed within the county. The objective is that at least 70% of the children in care be placed within the county. Agency data shows that 76.53% of Calhoun DSS children were placed within the county. Reviewers found that children placed outside of the county were in adjacent Richland or Orangeburg Counties.

Onsite Review Findings								
Permanency Item 12: Placement with Siblings in Foster Care								
	Area Needing							
	Stro	ength	Improv	vement	Not Ap	plicable		
# % # % # %								
Foster Care	7	100	0	0	3	0		

Explanation of Item 12: Placement with Siblings in Foster Care

This is an area of **Strength** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep siblings together when it is appropriate to do so. Seventy percent of the cases reviewed involved sibling groups. In every case, siblings were kept together when appropriate. This was true even of large sibling groups.

Onsite Review Findings									
Permanency Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care									
			Area No	eeding					
	Strength Improvement Not Applicable								
# % # % # %									
Foster Care	2	33	4	67	4	0			

Explanation of Item 13: Visiting with Siblings in Foster Care and with Parents

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to ensure that visits occur between children in foster care and their siblings and parents. In 67% of cases reviewed the agency failed to look for and engage the fathers of children in foster care. Consequently, the agency did not offer the fathers the opportunity to visit, or determine if such visits were in the child's best interest.

Onsite Review Findings Permanency Item 14: Preserving Connections								
Area Needing								
	Stre	ngth	Improv	ement	Not Ap	plicable		
# % # % # %								
Foster Care	6	100	0	0	4	0		

Explanation of Item 14: Preserving Connections

This is an area of **Strength** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to preserve children's connections to the people, places and things that are important to them. This was an area of strength in all cases. The agency worked to keep children within their same communities, and to help children maintain their relationships with family and friends. Reviewers saw instances of children seeing family members at school, and in other community locations on a daily basis.

Onsite Review Findings								
Permanency Item 15: Relative Placement								
			Area N	leeding				
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	oplicable		
# % # % # %								
Foster Care	5	50	5	50	0	0		

Explanation of Item 15: Relative Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to identify and assess relatives as potential placement resources for children in foster care. The agency's case management activities usually focused on the mothers of children in care, to the exclusion of non-custodial fathers. Consequently, in half of the cases reviewed the agency did not assess paternal relatives as placement options.

Onsite Review Findings									
Permanency Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents									
	Area Needing								
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	plicable			
# % # % # %									
Foster Care	0	0	4	100	6	0			

Explanation of Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to promote a supportive relationship between children in care and their parents, beyond the twice-minimum visitation requirement. Every applicable case reviewed needed improvement in this area. The agency consistently stuck to the twice-a-month minimum visitation requirement even when the needs of the child warranted more frequent visits.

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

The agency's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of four items:

- 17) Needs and services of child, parents and caregivers
- 18) Child and family involvement in case planning
- 19) Worker visits with child

Onsite Review Findings

20) Worker visits with parents

Area Needing Improvement

Area Needing Improvement

Area Needing Improvement

Area Needing Improvement

 Well Reing Item 1	7. Needs and Serv	ices of Child Parents Fos	ter Parents					
Well Being Item 17: Needs and Services of Child, Parents, Foster Parents Area Needing								

			Area N	leeding		
	Strength		Improv	vement	Not Applicable	
	#	%	# %		#	%
Foster Care	6	60	4	40	0	0
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0	0
Total Cases	13	65	7	35	0	0

Explanation of Item 17: Needs and Services of Child, Parents and Caregivers

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Calhoun DSS. This item asks two questions: 1) Were the needs of the child, parents, and caregivers assessed, and 2) Did the agency take steps to meet the identified needs? This is a weak area for both foster care and treatment cases. In 30% of treatment cases and 40% of foster care cases, the needs of fathers, foster parents, and alternate caretakers were not assessed. Consequently, the agency was in no position to address any needs that might exist.

Onsite Review Findings								
Well Being Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning								
	Area Needing							
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	plicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Foster Care	5	50	5	50	0	0		
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0	0		
Total Cases	12	60	8	40	0	0		

Explanation of Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. Half of the foster care cases needed improvement because case plans were incomplete, not current, or not signed by the parents. In the treatment cases that needed improvement, the agency failed to involve the alternate caregivers of children who had been removed from their parents.

Agency Data									
Performance	Measure 14: Face-to-Face V	isits With Children	1						
Objective: >	= 100% (Agency Policy)								
	Number of Children	Number of	Percent of	Number of					
	Under Agency Supervision	Children Visited	Children	Children Above					
	at Least One Complete	Every Month	Visited Every	or (Below)					
	Calendar Month	-	Month	Standard					
Foster Care	92	90	97.83%	(2)					
Treatment	337	225	66.77%	(32)					

Explanation of Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Calhoun DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with children under agency supervision, and evaluates the quality of those visits. State law and agency policy requires that children under agency supervision be seen each month. This is a relatively strong area for foster care in that 97.83% of those children received

face-to-face visits each month. Only two children were not seen every month. Almost 80% of those visits occurred in the child's place of residence, which is well above the 50% requirement. However, the 66.77% of children in treatment cases visited each month fell below agency requirements. Reviewers found that the content of all visits addressed safety, permanency and child well-being issues.

Onsite Review Findings									
Well Being Item 20: Worker Visits with Parent(s)									
Area Needing									
	Stre	ngth	Impro	vement	Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	0	0	7	100	3	0			
Treatment	9	90	1	10	0	0			
Total Cases	9	53	8	47	3	0			

Explanation of Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Calhoun DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with parents, and evaluates the quality of those visits. Although this was a relatively strong area in the treatment cases reviewed, every foster care case needed improvement. This was due to the agency's practice of ignoring the fathers of children in care. This practice has serious permanency implications when and if the agency sees the need to terminate parental rights.

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

The agency's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of one item:

21) Educational need of the child

Strength

Onsite Review Findings							
Well Being Item 21: Educational Needs of the Child							
			Area N	leeding			
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	8	100	0	0	2	0	
Treatment	9	100	0	0	1	0	
Total Cases	17	100	0	0	3	0	

Explanation of Item 21: Educational Needs of the Child

This is an area of **Strength** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and address the educational needs of children under agency supervision. This was an area of strength in every case. Reviewers found that workers made direct contact with the school and there were also copies of grade reports and attendance records in all foster care cases. The educational needs of all children in treatment cases were assessed during monthly visits.

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

The agency's performance on this outcome is based on the rating of two items:

22) Physical health of the child

Area Needing Improvement

23) Mental health of the child

Strength

Onsite Review Findings							
Well Being Item 22: Physical Health of the Child							
	Area			leeding			
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0	
Treatment	9	90	1	10	0	0	
Total Cases	17	85	3	15	0	0	

Explanation of Item 22: Physical Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and address the medical needs of children under agency supervision. This was an area of strength for 85% of the cases reviewed. Copies of medical, dental and immunizations records were in all the cases. In 15% of the cases reviewed, the physical health assessments identified issues that needed attention. In those cases the agency failed to follow up to determine if the children's medical needs were met.

Onsite Review F	<u>'indings</u>					
Well Being Item	23: Ment	al Health	of the Child			
			Area N	leeding		
	Stre	Strength		vement	Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	88	1	12	1	0
Treatment	7	100	0	0	3	0
Total Cases	15	94	1	6	4	0

Explanation of Item 23: Mental Health of the Child

This is an area of **Strength** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the mental health needs of children under agency supervision. In 94% of the cases reviewed, the children's mental health needs were assessed and met.

	Unfounded Investigations				
		Yes	No		
Investiga	ation initiated timely?	5	0		
Was asso	essment adequate?	3	2		
Was dec	ision appropriate?	5	0		

Explanation of Item 24: Unfounded Investigations

This is an area of **Strength** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the agency's investigative process and determines if decisions were supported by the facts of the cases. All five investigations were initiated timely. The assessment was not adequate in two of the five cases reviewed because the other children in the home were not interviewed or assessed.

Was Intoles Annuanciatally Consoned Out?	Yes	No	Cannot Determine
Was Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	Yes	No	Not Applicable
	res	110	Not Applicable
Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?	0	1	1
Were Appropriate Referrals Made?	0	0	2

Screened Out Intakes

Explanation of Item 25: Screened Out Intakes

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the process by which the agency screens out reports of incidents of abuse and/or neglect to determine if the intakes were appropriately screened out. One of the two intakes screened out should have been accepted for investigation. In one intake, the allegation was that a three year old complained that her private area hurts. The reviewers found that the documentation did not justifying screening out the report. According to CAPSS, seven days later, a second report of sexual abuse involving that same three old child was accepted and is being investigated.

Foster Home Licenses

Explanation of Item 26: Foster Home Licenses

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Calhoun DSS. This item evaluates the process by which the agency ensures that all foster homes comply with licensing requirements. A review of licensing records showed some areas of strength, and many areas needing attention. There was one invalid license. Most of the quarterly visits were conducted but the Quarterly Home Visit Guide was not completed. The records were not set up according to policy. Documentation in the hard files and in CAPSS was not consistent. In most of the licensing files, safety checks were not completed or updated yearly on required household members.

Calhoun County DSS Summary Sheet							
		Performance Item Ratings					
	Performance Item or Outcome	Strength	Area Needing Improvement	N/A*			
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.							
Item 1: Str	Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	9/9=100%	0	11			
Item 2: Str	Repeat maltreatment	20/20=100%	0	0			
Safety Ou	tcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes wh	enever possible and	appropriate.	·			
Item 3: Str	Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	11/11=100%	0	9			
Item 4: ANI	Risk of harm to child(ren)	16/20=80%	4/20=20%	0			
Permaner	ncy Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in		ons.				
Item 5: *Str	Foster care re-entries	2/2 = 100%	0	8			
Item 6: ANI	Stability of foster care placement	8/10 = 80%	2/10 = 20%	0			
Item 7: Str	Permanency goal for child	10/10=100%	0	0			
Item 8: ANI	Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	3/4 = 75%	1/4 = 25%	6			
Item 9: ANI	Adoption	0	4/4 = 100	6			
Item 10: Str	Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	2/2= 100%	0	4			
Perma	nency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships a	and connections is p	preserved for children.				
Item 11: Str	Proximity of foster care placement	10/10= 100%	0	0			
Item 12: Str	Placement with siblings	7/7 = 100%	0	3			
Item 13: ANI	Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	2/6 = 33%	4/6 = 67%	4			
Item 14: Str	Preserving connections	6/6 = 100%	0	4			
Item 15: ANI	Relative placement	5/10 = 50%	5/10 = 50%	0			
Item 16: ANI	Relationship of child in care with parents	0	4/4 = 100%	6			
7	Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity t	o provide for their o	children's needs.	-			
Item 17: ANI	Needs and services of child, parents, caregiver	13/20=65%	7/20=35%	0			
Item 18: ANI	Child and family involvement in case planning	12/20=60%	8/20=40%	0			
Item 19: ANI	Worker visits with child	16/20=80%	4/20=20%	0			
Item 20: ANI	Worker visits with parent(s)	9/17=53%	8/17=47%	3			
,	Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate servi	ces to meet their ed	ucational needs.	•			
Item 21: Str	Educational needs of the child	17/17=100%	0	3			
Well B	Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to me	eet their physical an	d mental health needs.				
Item 22: ANI	Physical health of the child	17/20=85%	3/20=15%	0			
Item 23: Str	Mental health of the child	15/16=94%	1/16=6%	4			

The objective is that 95% of cases be rated "Strength".

Str = Strength

ANI = Area Needing Improvement
* = Rating based on agency data, not onsite review findings