During the week of January 28 to February 1, 2008, a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Charleston 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, Charleston DSS supervisors, representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

Period under Review: January 1, 2007 to December 13, 2007

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.

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

Area Needing Improvement Strength

2) Repeat Maltreatment

Agency Data

Performance Measure 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations

Objective: 100% in <= 24 hours (state law)

Objective. 100/01	Objective. 100/0 m <= 24 hours (state law)									
	Number of	Number of	Percent of	Numbers of						
	Determinations	Investigations	Investigations	Investigations						
		Initiated Timely	Initiated Timely	Above (Below)						
				Objective						
State	18,824	17,791	94.5%	(1033)						
Charleston	1,345	1,282	95.3%	(63)						

Explanation of Item 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Charleston DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. The outcome report indicates that for the 12 month period under review, Charleston DSS initiated 1,282 of its 1,345 investigations of alleged abuse and neglect within 24 hours. The agency failed to initiate 63 investigations within the 24 hour time limit. Onsite reviewers found that the agency correctly assigned risk ratings to intakes. Reviewers also found that high risk cases were investigated within the two hour timeframe required by agency policy.

Onsite Review Findings									
Safety Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment									
			Area N	leeding					
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0			
Treatment	9	90	1	10	0	0			
Total Cases	19	95	1	5	0	0			

Explanation of Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment

This is area of **Strength** for Charleston DSS. This item measures the occurrence of maltreatment among children under agency supervision. Agency data shows that 88.78% of the treatment cases closed were not involved in a subsequent indicated incident of maltreatment. Reviewers found that 95% of the children under agency supervision did not experience 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 Area Needing Improvement

Onsite Review Findings									
Safety Item 3: Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in Home and Prevent Removal.									
	Strength		_	leeding vement	Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	3	100	0	0	7	0			
Treatment	8	80	2	20	0	0			
Total Cases	11	85	2	15	7	0			

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

This is an Area Needing Improvement for Charleston DSS. This item assesses whether services were adequate to protect children in their home and prevent their removal and placement into foster care. Every foster care case reviewed showed that the decision to remove the children from their home and place them in foster care was appropriate. In 80% of the treatment cases reviewed, families received services needed to ensure the safety of the children who remained with their parents or relatives. However, 20% of the families did not receive services needed to

ensure the safety of the children in the home. This was often because safety and treatment plans did not address the underlying causes of the problems, and therefore did not direct clients to the kinds of services needed to reduce risks and prevent removal.

Onsite Review Findings

Safety Item 4: Risk of Harm

	Stren	Area NeedingStrengthImprovement		Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0
Treatment	8	80	2	20	0	0
Total Cases	16	80	4	20	0	0

Explanation of Item 4: Risk of Harm

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Charleston DSS. This item assesses whether the agency's intervention reduced risks of harm to children. In 20% of the treatment and foster care cases, risk of harm was not adequately managed. In those cases, caseworkers clearly described serious risk factors that remained in the home, but failed to take actions needed to reduce those risk factors. In those cases, the agency failed to assess relative caregivers and other adults living in the home.

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	Strength
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, what percent did Not re-enter foster care within 12 months of the date of their discharge.

Objective: > 90.1% (federal standard)								
	Number of Foster	Number of	Percent of Children	Number of				
	Children	Children Who Did	Who Did Not	Children				
Reunited During		Not Re-enter Foster	Re-Enter Foster	Above				
	Reporting Period	Care Within 12	Care Within 12	(Below)				
		Months	Months	Objective				
State	2458	2316	94.22%	101.3				
Charleston	159	149	93.77%	5.7				

Explanation of Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries

This is area of **Strength** for Charleston DSS. This item measures the frequency of children reentering foster care within a year of discharge. To meet the minimum requirement for this item, 90.1% of children must not re-enter foster care within a year of discharge. Agency data indicates that 93.71% of Charleston County children did not re-enter 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, what percentage had no more than two placement settings?

Objective: >= 86.0% (federal standard)									
	FC Services	Number with	Percent with	Number					
	Open > 7 days	No More than 2	No More than 2	Above					
	and < 12 months	placements	placements	(Below)					
				Objective					
State	4,321	3,438	79.56%	(308.3)					
Charleston	339	260	76.70%	(33.9)					

Explanation of Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Charleston DSS. This item measures the frequency of placement changes for children in foster care, and assesses the reasons for those changes. The federal standard is that 86% of the children in care (at least 8 days but less than 12 months) have no more than two placements in a year. Agency data shows that 76.70% of children managed by the county office had no more than two placements.

Onsite Review Findings									
Permanency Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child									
			Area Ne	eeding					
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	0			

Explanation of Item 7: Permanency Goal for Children

This is an area of **Strength** for Charleston DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness of permanency goals for children in foster care and the timeliness of those permanency decisions. Reviewers found that in 90% of the cases, the agency quickly determined the appropriate permanency goal for children in foster care.

Agency Data

Performance Measure 8: Time to Achieve Reunification – Of all children who were reunited 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 reunited in less than 12 months from the date of their latest removal from home?

Objective: >= 75.2% (federal standard)									
	Number of Children Number of Children		Percent of Children	Number of					
	Returned to	Returned to	Returned to	Children					
	Parents/Caretakers	Parents/Caretakers	Parents/Caretakers	Above					
		after in Care < 12	after in Care < 12	(Below)					
		months	months	Objective					
State	2,296	1,776	77.35%	49.4					
Charleston	148	118	79.73%	6.7					

Explanation of Item 8: Reunification or Permanent Placement with Relatives

This is an area of **Strength** for Charleston 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 79.73% of children who entered foster care in Charleston returned home within a year. That performance surpassed the 75.2% federal standard.

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% (federal standard)

objective. >= 50.076 (redefail standard)								
	Number of	Number of	Percent of	Adoptions				
	Adoption	Adoption	Adoption	Above (Below)				
	Finalized	Finalized in< 24	Finalized in < 24	Federal Standard				
		Months	Months					
State	399	69	17.3%	0				
Charleston	45	9	20.0%	(7.5)				

Onsite Review Findings									
Permanency Item 9: Length of Time to Achieve Adoption									
			Area Ne	eeding					
	Strength		Improvement		Not App	licable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	0	0	6	100	4	0			

Explanation of Item 9: Adoption

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Charleston DSS. This item evaluates the process within the child welfare system to achieve timely adoptions for children in foster care. The federal standard is that at least 36.6% of adoptions be completed within 24 months of a child entering care. Agency data shows that 20% of Charleston DSS adoptions were completed within 24 months; 22.3% of Merit Hearings were completed timely; 31.44% of Permanency Hearings were completed timely. Stakeholders explained that continuances are a chronic problem for Charleston DSS hearings.

Onsite Review Findings

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

	Area NeedingStrengthImprovement			Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	100	0	0	8	0

Explanation of Item 10: Permanency Goal of APPLA

This is area of **Strength** for Charleston DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness and effectiveness of services provided to children with the permanency plan of APPLA. Reviewers found that children with this plan were receiving appropriate independent living services.

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

This outcome is based on the rating of 6 items:

- 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) Relationship of child in care with parents

Strength Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement Strength 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 percent were placed within their county of origin?

Objective: >=70% (agency standard) Number of Number of Percent of Number of Children Children Placed Children in Children Placed Above (Below) Care 01/01/07 -Within County Within County Objective 12/31/07 of Origin of Origin 4,233 (391.9)State 6,607 64.1% Charleston 407 70.1% 581 0.3

Explanation of Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement

This is an area of **Strength** for Charleston County 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 at least 70% of the children in care be placed within the county. Agency data shows that Charleston DSS exceeded this standard.

Onsite Review Findings								
Permanency Item 12: Placement with Siblings								
Area Needing								
	Stren	gth	Improv	vement	Not Applicable			
	#	%	# %		#	%		
Foster Care	5	83	1	17	4	0		

Explanation of Item 12: Placement with Siblings in Foster Care

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Charleston DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep siblings together when it is appropriate to do so. Although most siblings were kept together, the percentage (83%) was not high enough to meet agency standards.

Onsite Review Findings								
Permanency Item	13: Visiti	ng with Par	ents and Siblin	gs in Foster (Care			
			Area Ne	eeding				
	Strength		Improv	ement	Not Applicable			
	#	%	# %		#	%		
Foster Care	5	71	2	29	3	0		

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Charleston DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to ensure that visits occur between children in foster care and their parents and siblings. Reviewers found that 71% of visits between the children in foster care and their parents were occurring as required by policy. That level of performance did not meet the agency's 90% compliance standard.

Onsite Review Findings								
Permanency Item 14	1: Preserving	connection	ns					
	Area Needing							
	Stren	gth	Impro	ovement	Not Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Foster Care	5	100	0	0	5	0		

Explanation of Item 14: Preserving Connections

This is an area of **Strength** for Charleston DSS. Whereas Item 13 addressed parents and siblings, this item evaluates the agency's efforts to preserve children's connections to the people, places and things that are important to them. In 100% of the cases reviewed, onsite reviewers

rated this item strength. Charleston DSS did a very good job of preserving the relationships that were important to children in foster care. Reviewers saw many examples of relatives involved in the children's lives.

Onsite Review Fin	ndings						
Permanency Item	15: Relative	e Placement					
	Area Needing						
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	6	60	4	40	0	0	

Explanation of Item 15: Relative Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Charleston DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to identify and assess relatives as potential placement resources for children in foster care. Sixty percent of the cases reviewed were rated strength for this item. Reviewers found instances of relatives who expressed interest in caring for children, but no evidence that those relatives were assessed. Reviewers also found that relatives of the custodial parent (usually the mother) were assessed, but relatives of the non-custodial parent (usually the father) were not assessed.

Onsite Review Findings								
Permanency Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents								
		Area Needing						
	Strength		Improv	vement	Not Applicable			
	#	# %		%	#	%		
Foster Care	2	2 67 1 33 7 0						

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Charleston 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. Thirty-three percent of the cases needed improvement in this area. Reviewers did not consistently find increased parental involvement when the needs of children clearly called for it – for example, with preschool aged children, and with children who were to return home within six months.

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

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
- 20) Worker visits with parents

Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement

Onsite Review Findings

Well Being Item 17: Needs and Services of Child, Parents, Foster Parents										
			Area N	leeding						
	Strength		Improv	vement	Not Applicable					
	#	%	#	%	#	%				
Foster Care	7	70	3	30	0	0				
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0	0				
Total Cases	14	70	6	30	0	0				

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Charleston 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? In 70% of treatment and foster care cases, this item was rated strength. The most common deficiencies were; a) failure to address the needs of alternative caregivers, and b) failure to assess non-custodial parents and paramours who were significant persons in the child's life.

Onsite Review Findings										
Well Being Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning										
			Area N	leeding						
	Strength		Improv	vement	Not Applicable					
	#	%	#	%	#	%				
Foster Care	5	50	5	50	0	0				
Treatment	8	80	2 20		0	0				
Total Cases	13	67	7	33	0	0				

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Charleston DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. This was an area of strength for half of the foster care cases and 80% of the treatment cases. Reviewers found that diligent searches for absent fathers and mothers were completed in most in-home treatment cases, but in very few foster care cases.

Agency Da	Agency Data									
Performance Measure 14: Face-to-Face Visits With Children										
Objective: >	= 100% (agency policy)									
	Number of Children	Number of	Percent of	Number of						
	Under Agency	Children Visited	Children Visited	Children Above						
	Supervision at Least	Every Month	Every Month	or (Below)						
	One Complete	-	-	Standard						
	Calendar Month									
Foster Care	420	362	86.19%	(58)						
Treatment	2,185	981	44.90%	(1,204)						

Explanation of Item 19: Worker Visits with Children

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Charleston 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. In foster care, agency data shows that 86.19% of children managed by the county office, 86.69% of children managed by MTS, and 68.45% of children managed by the Charleston Adoptions office were seen each month during the period under review. In CPS treatment, agency data shows that 44.90% of the children were seen each month.

Onsite Review Findings								
Well Being Item 2	0: Worke	er Visits v	with Parent(s)	1				
			Area N	leeding				
	Strength		Improv	vement	Not Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Foster Care	2	40	3	60	5	0		
Treatment	7	70	3 30		0	0		
Total Cases	9	60	6	40	5	0		

Explanation of Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Charleston DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with parents, and evaluates the quality of those visits. This was a strong area for 40% of the foster care and 70% of the in-home treatment cases. Worker visits with fathers were more likely to be missed than visits with the children's mothers.

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

21) Educational need of the child

Area Needing Improvement

Onsite Review Findings										
Well Being Item 21: Educational Needs of Child										
			Area N	leeding						
	Streng	gth	Improv	vement	Not Applicable					
	#	%	#	%	#	%				
Foster Care	6	6 85		15	3	0				
Treatment	5	83	1	17	4	0				
Total Cases	11	85	2	15	7	0				

Explanation of Item 21: Educational Needs of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Charleston 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 for 85% of the cases reviewed which did not meet the agency objective of 90%. In general, caseworkers managing both foster care and in-home treatment cases adequately assessed and attended to the educational needs of the children under agency supervision. In the deficient cases, the worker often relied on the word of the child or caregiver to assess school performance, but failed to make direct contact with the school to verify that information.

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

22) Physical health of the child

23) Mental health of the child

Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement

Onsite Review Findings									
Well Being Item 22: Physical Health of the Child									
			Area N	leeding					
	Strength		Improv	vement	Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0			
Treatment	8	80	2	20	0	0			
Total Cases	16	80	4	20	0	0			

Explanation of Item 22: Physical Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Charleston DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and attend to the medical needs of children under agency supervision. This was an area of strength for 80% of both foster care and in-home treatment cases. In the deficient treatment cases the medical needs of the children were not assessed. In the deficient foster care cases the children did not receive their annual or biannual physical examinations as required by policy.

Onsite Review Fi	ndings						
Well Being Item	23: Ment	al Health	of the Child				
			Area N	leeding			
	Strength		Improv	vement	Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	6	75	2	25	2	0	
Treatment	4	57	3	43	3	0	
Total Cases	10	67	5	33	5	0	

Explanation of Item 23: Mental Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Charleston DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the mental health needs of children under agency supervision. This was an area of strength for 67% of the cases reviewed. The most common deficiency was a failure to assess the mental health needs of the children. When those assessments did not occur the children did not consistently receive the services needed to address their emotional or behavioral needs.

Unfounded Investigations				
	Yes	No		
Investigation initiated timely?	5	0		
Was assessment adequate?	5	0		
Was decision appropriate?	5	0		

Explanation of Item 24: Unfounded Investigations

This is an area of **Strength** Charleston DSS. This item evaluates the agency's investigative process and determines if decisions were supported by the facts of the cases. All of the assessments were thorough. All of the decisions were appropriate and supported by the evidence gathered.

Screened Out Intakes					
	Yes	No	Cannot Determine		
Was Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	9	1	0		
	Yes	No	Not Applicable		
Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?	5	2	3		
Were Appropriate Referrals Made?	0	2	8		

Explanation of Item 25: Screened Out Intakes

This is an area of **Strength** for Charleston DSS. This item evaluates the process by which the agency screens out reports of incidents that the agency does not have the legal authority to investigate. One of the 10 intakes screened out described a situation that posed serious risks of harm to the child in the home. That intake required either an agency investigation or referral to law enforcement or mental health.

Foster Home Licenses

Explanation of Item 26: Foster Home Licenses

This is an area of **Strength** for Charleston 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 many areas of strength, and a few areas needing attention. Documentation in the hard files and in CAPSS was consistent. There were no unlicensed open foster homes.

Charleston DSS Rating Summary						
		Performance Item Ratings				
Performance Item or Outcome		Strength	Area Needing Improvement	N/A*		
Safety Ou	tcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from	abuse and neglect.				
Item 1: ANI	Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	7/8=88%	1/8=12%	12		
Item 2: Str	Repeat maltreatment	19/20=95%	1/20=5%	0		
Safety Out	come 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes w	henever possible ar	nd appropriate.			
Item 3: ANI	Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	11/13=85%	2/13=15%	7		
Item 4: ANI	Risk of harm to child(ren)	16/20=80%	4/20=20%	0		
Permanen	cy Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in	-	ions.			
Item 5: Str	Foster care re-entries	1/1=100%	0	9		
Item 6: ANI*	Stability of foster care placement	10/10=100%	0	0		
Item 7: Str	Permanency goal for child	9/10=90%	1/10=10%	0		
Item 8: Str*	Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	1/2 = 50%	1/2 = 50%	8		
Item 9: ANI	Adoption	0	6/6=100%	4		
Item 10: Str	Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	2/2=100%	0	0		
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.						
Item 11: Str	Proximity of foster care placement	7/7=100%	0	3		
Item 12: ANI	Placement with siblings	5/6=83%	1/6=17%	4		
Item 13: ANI	Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	5/7=71%	2/7=29%	3		
Item 14: Str	Preserving connections	5/5=100%	0	5		
Item 15: ANI	Relative placement	6/10-60%	4/10=40%	0		
Item 16: ANI	Relationship of child in care with parents	2/3=67%	1/3=33%	7		
v	Vell Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity	to provide for their	children's needs.	-		
Item 17: ANI	Needs and services of child, parents, caregiver	14/20=70%	6/20=30%	0		
Item 18: ANI	Child and family involvement in case planning	12/18=67%	6/18=33%	2		
Item 19: ANI *	Worker visits with child	18/20=90%	2/20=10%	0		
Item 20: ANI	Worker visits with parent(s)	9/15=60%	6/15=40%	5		
	Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate serv	ices to meet their e	ducational needs.	-		
Item 21: ANI	Educational needs of the child	11/13=85%	2/13=15%	0		
Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.						
Item 22: ANI	Physical health of the child	16/20=80%	4/20=20%	. 0		
Item 23: ANI	Mental health of the child	10/15=67%	5/15=33%	5		
	tive is that 000% of asses he rated "Strength"		- • •			

The objective is that 90% of cases be rated "Strength".

Str = Strength

ANI = Area Needing Improvement

* = Rating based on agency data, not onsite review findings