During the week of July 21, 2008 - July 25, 2008 a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Darlington 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, Darlington DSS supervisors, representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

Period under Review: July 1, 2007 - June 30, 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. Agency data 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, and Foster Care.

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 Strength

2) Repeat Maltreatment

Agency Data

Performance Measure 1: Initiating CPS Investigations

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

	Number of	Number of	Percent of	Number of					
	Investigations	Investigations	Investigations	Investigations					
		Initiated Timely	Initiated Timely	Above (Below)					
				Objective					
State	18,774	17966	95.70%	(808)					
Darlington	347	346	99.7%	(1)					

Explanation of Item 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations

This is an area of **Strength** for Darlington 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, Darlington initiated 346 of its 347 investigations of alleged abuse and neglect within 24 hours. The onsite review included the one case that needed improvement in the data report. Reviewers found that the initial contact was made timely but the caseworker made a data entry error in CAPSS, causing it to appear that the initial contact was made prior to the report being accepted.

Agency Data

Performance Measure 3: Treatment Cases With No New Indicated Reports – Of all treatment cases that were closed during the year reporting period, what percentage did NOT have a new founded intake within 12 months of the treatment case being closed?

Objective: \geq 87.55% Agency Average									
	Number of	Number of Cases							
	Treatment	Treatment Cases	Treatment Cases	Above (Below)					
	Cases Closed	with no founded that did not have a S		State Average					
		intake within 12	new founded intake						
		months	within 12 months						
State	5,165	4,530	87.71%						
Darlington	131	119	90.84%	4.1					

Explanation of Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment

This is an area of **Strength** for Darlington DSS. This item measures the occurrence of maltreatment among children under agency supervision, or within a year of having their case closed by the agency. Based on agency data, Darlington surpassed the state average for this item. The onsite review confirmed that children under agency supervision rarely 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 **St**
- 4) Risk of Harm

Strength Area Needing Improvement

Onsite Review Findings										
Safety Item 3: Services to Family to Protect Children in Home and Prevent Removal										
	Area Needing									
	Stren	gth	Improv	vement	Not Applicable					
	#	%	#	%	#	%				
Foster Care	2	100	0	0	8	0				
Treatment	10	100	0	0	0	0				
Total Cases	12	100	0	0	0	0				

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Darlington DSS. This item assesses whether services were adequate to protect children in their home and prevent their removal and placement into foster care. In every foster care case reviewed the decision to remove the children from their homes and place them in foster care was supported by the facts of the case. The services offered to families in in-home treatment cases were directed at the specific needs identified in assessments.

Onsite Review Findings

Safety Item 4: Risk of Harm

	Area NeedingStrengthImprovement				Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	0	
Treatment	9	90	1	10	0	0	
Total Cases	18	90	1	10	0	0	

Explanation of Item 4: Risk of Harm

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington DSS. This item assesses whether the agency's interventions reduced risk of harm to children. Although risk of harm was appropriately managed in 90% of the cases, this fell short of the 95% compliance standard. The agency fell short of the standard because of cases involving serious risk factors in which the agency did not intervene when parents failed to complete any of the requirements on the treatment plan.

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
6) Stability of foster care placement
7) Permanency goal for child
8) Reunification or permanent placement with relatives
9) Adoption
10) Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)
Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement 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 re-enter foster care within 12 months of the date of their discharge.

Objective: \geq 90.1% (federal standard)									
	Number Children	Number of	Percent of Children	Number of					
	Reunified During	Children	Discharged Who	Children Above					
	Reporting Period	Discharged Who	Did Not Re-enter	(Below)					
		Did Not Re-enter	Foster Care	Objective					
		Foster Care		-					
State	2,501	2,315	92.56%	61.6					
Darlington	132	118	89.39%	(0.90)					

Explanation of Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington DSS. This item measures the frequency of children re-entering foster care within a year of discharge. The federal standard for this measure is that at least 90.1% of children entering foster care not be re-entries within a year of discharge from care. Agency data indicates that 14 of the 132 children discharged from foster care in the past 12 months re-entered foster care. This fell short of the federal standard by one child.

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: \geq 86% (federal standard)									
	FC Services	Number With No	Percent with	Number of					
	Open > 7 days	More than 2	No More than	Children Above					
	and < 12	Placements	2 Placements	(Below) Objective					
	Months			_					
State	4,105	3,062	74.59%	(250.7)					
Darlington	133	100	75.19%	(7.3)					

Explanation of Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placements

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington DSS. This item measures the frequency of placement changes for children in foster care, and assesses the reasons for those changes. The standard applied to this item is that at least 86% of children in care experience two or fewer

placements during the period under review. Agency data indicated that 75.19% of children managed by Darlington County had two or fewer placements. Agency staff indicated that the shortage of suitable foster homes contributed to the instability of children by creating a reliance on temporary placements.

Onsite Review Findings

Permanency Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child

	Area Needing					
	Strength Improvement		Not Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0

Explanation of Item 7: Permanency Goal for Children

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness of permanency goals for children in foster care and the timeliness of those permanency decisions. The onsite review found that 20% of the cases needed improvement with this item because the permanency plans were not realistic based on the facts in the cases.

Onsite Review Findings											
Permanency Item 8: Time to Achieve Reunification											
	Area Needing										
	Stren	gth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	plicable					
	#	# % # % # %									
Foster Care	2	50	2	50	6	0					

Explanation of Item 8: Reunification or Permanent Placement with Relatives

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington DSS. This item evaluates the activities and processes necessary to accomplish the goal of reunification with caregivers or placement with relatives. In 50% of the cases, reviewers found that Merit Hearings were continued repeatedly, causing some children to be in care for over a year without a finding by the court. In those cases, the children had no court-sanctioned permanency plan.

Agency Data

Measure 9: Length of 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.	Objective. >= 50.0% (redefai standard)									
Report Period: May 1,2007 to April 30, 2008										
	Number ofNumber ofPercent ofNumber of									
	Adoptions	Adoptions Adoptions Adoptions Children Above								
	Finalized	Finalized < 24		Finalized in < 24	(Below) Objective					
		Months		Months						
State	486		89	18.31%	88.9					
Darlington	3		0	0.00	(1.1)					

Explanation of Item 9: Adoption

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington 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 indicates that Darlington County finalized three adoptions but none were completed within 24 months. Reviewers saw numerous delays in filing petitions and continued hearings in every case involving children with the plan of Adoption.

Onsite Review Findings

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

	Strength Improvement		Not Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	100	0	0	9	0

Explanation of Item 10: Permanency Goal of APPLA

This is area of **Strength** for Darlington 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.

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

Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement

Agency Data

Measure 11: Foster Children Placed Within County of Origin – Of all children in foster care during the reporting period (excluding IFC&CS and Adoptions children), what percentage are placed within the county of origin?

Objective: >= 70% (Agency established objective)

Report Period	Report Period: June 6, 2007 – June 5, 2008										
	Total children < 18 years old and in care during the report period	Number of Children Placed in County of Origin	Percent of placed in County of Origin	Number of children Above or (Below) State Objective							
State	6,507	4,346	66.79%	(208.9)							
Darlington	190	119	62.63%	(14.0)							

Explanation of Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington 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 62.63% of Darlington DSS children were placed within the county. The shortage of foster homes contributed to this problem.

Onsite Review Findings										
Permanency Item 12: Placement with Siblings										
	Area Needing									
	Stren	gth	Improv	vement	Not App	licable				
# % # % # %										
Foster Care	5	71	2	29	3	0				

Explanation of Item 12: Placement with Siblings in Foster Care

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep siblings together when it is appropriate to do so. In 29% of the cases siblings were in separate placements because of a shortage of foster parents willing to accept sibling groups and older children.

Onsite Review Findings						
Permanency Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care						
	Area Needing					
	Stre	ngth	Improv	ement	Not App	licable
# % # % # %						
Foster Care	3	33	6	67	1	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to ensure that visits occur between children in foster care and their siblings and parents. Sixty-Seven percent of the cases had deficiencies in this area because children were not consistently visiting with their parents. There were no explanations as to why visits were arranged between children in care and their mother, but not their father. Visits between children in separate foster care placements were not part of visitation plans.

Onsite Review Findings							
Permanency Item 14: Preserving Connections							
	Area Needing						
	Stren	gth	Impro	ovement	Not App	licable	
# % # % # %							
Foster Care	4	57	3	43	3	0	

Explanation of Item 14: Preserving Connections

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to preserve children's connections to the people, places and things that are important to them. In 43% of the cases, reviewers found that the agency's efforts to preserve connections were limited to the children's mothers, to the exclusion of other important relationships.

Onsite Review Findings							
Permanency Item 15: Relative Placement							
	Area Needing						
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	plicable	
# % # % # %						%	
Foster Care	3	30	7	70	0	0	

Explanation of Item 15: Relative Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to identify and assess relatives as potential placement resources for children in foster care. Seventy percent of the cases needed improvement because the agency failed to assess paternal relatives to determine if any of them might be placement resources for the children in care.

Onsite Review Findings								
Permanency Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents								
	Area Needing							
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	oplicable		
	# % # % # %							
Foster Care	2	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington 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. In 60% of the cases reviewers did not 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 a few weeks.

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
- 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 Needing						
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Foster Care	6	60	4	40	0	0		
Treatment	1	10	9	90	0	0		
Total Cases	7	35	13	65	0	0		

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington 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 40% of foster care cases and in 90% of the treatment cases, this was an area needing improvement. 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 Needing						
	Stren	lgth	Improv	vement	Not Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Foster Care	1	14	6	88	3	0		
Treatment	0	0	10	100	0	0		
Total Cases	1	6	16	94	3	0		

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. Reviewers found that involving parents and age-appropriate children in case planning was not evident in 94% of the cases reviewed.

Agency Data									
Well Being Ite	Well Being Item 19: Face-to-Face Visits with Children (<18 years of age)								
Objective: 10	0% (Agency Policy)								
Report Period:	May 1, 2007 - April 30,	, 2008							
	Number of Children	Number of	Percent of	Children Without a					
	Under Agency	Children	Children	Documented Face-to-					
	Supervision at Least	Visited Every	Visited Every	Face Visit Every					
	One Complete	Month	Month	Month					
	Calendar Month								
Foster Care	139	122	87.77%	17					
Treatment	328	274	83.54%	54					

Explanation of Item 19: Face-to-Face Visits with Children

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with children under agency supervision, and evaluates the quality of those visits. Agency data shows that 87.77% of children in foster care, and 83.54% of children in treatment cases were seen each month. In treatment cases there were instances of worker visits that did not address relevant issues.

Onsite Review Findings

Well Being Item 20: Worker Visits with Parent(s)

Wen Deing Hein 20. Worker Visits with Farent(s)							
		Area Needing					
	Stren	gth	Improve	ement	Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	1	20	4	80	5	0	
Treatment	0	0	10	100	0	0	
Total Cases	1	7	14	93	5	0	

Explanation of Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with parents, and evaluates the quality of those visits. Every treatment case needed improvement and 80% of the foster care cases needed improvement. The agency consistently ignored the legal rights and the relationships of the fathers of the children under agency supervision.

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

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

21) Educational needs of the child Area Needing Improvement

Onsite Review Findings

Well Being Item 21: Educational Needs of Child

	Strength			leeding vement	Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	4	67	2	33	4	0	
Treatment	1	17	5	83	4	0	
Total Cases	5 42		7	58	8	0	

Explanation of Item 21: Educational Needs of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and address the educational needs of children under agency supervision. In 58% of the cases, reviewers could not find evidence of direct contact with school officials or documents from schools to assess the educational needs of children. Workers were meeting with children in the schools but there was no evidence that they spoke with school officials.

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

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

- 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 Needing						
	S #	trength %	#	%	#	%
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 22: Physical Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the medical needs of children under agency supervision. Sixty-five percent of the cases reviewed were rated strength for this item. Both foster care and in-home treatment cases showed deficiencies in this area. In some instances there was a failure to assess the medical needs of the children. In other cases, there was no evidence that caseworkers followed-up to determine if the identified medical needs were being addressed.

Onsite Review Findings								
Well Being Item 23: Mental Health of the Child								
		Area Needing						
	Strength Improvement			vement	Not Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Foster Care	4	67	2	33	4	0		
Treatment	6	75	2	25	2	0		
Total Cases	10	71	4	29	6	0		

Explanation of Item 23: Mental Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Darlington DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the mental health needs of children under agency supervision. Both foster care and in-home treatment cases showed deficiencies in this area. The deficiencies in this Item and Item 22 above resulted from a combination of overwhelmed supervisors trying to monitor the work of too many inexperienced caseworkers.

Unfounded Investigations

	Yes	No
Was the investigation initiated timely?	5	0
Was the assessment adequate?	4	1
Was the decision appropriate?	5	0

Explanation of Item 24: Unfounded Investigations

This is an area of **Strength** for Darlington DSS. This item evaluates the agency's investigative process and determines if decisions were supported by the facts of the cases. The decision in each of the cases was supported by the evidence collected during assessments.

Screened Out Intakes						
	Yes	No	Cannot Determine			
Was the Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	10	0	0			
			Not Applicable			
Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?	2	1	7			
Were Appropriate Referrals Made?	1	0	8			

Explanation of Item 25: Screened Out Intakes

This is an area of **Strength** for Darlington 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 appropriate screened out. All intakes that were screened out were done so appropriately because they did not allege anything that met the legal definition of abuse or neglect.

Foster Home Licenses

Explanation of Item 26: Foster Home Licenses

This is an area of **Strength** for Darlington DSS. This item evaluates the process by which the agency ensures that all foster homes comply with licensing requirements. There were no unlicensed foster homes. A review of licensing records showed many areas of strength, and a few areas needing attention.

Performance Ratings								
			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 Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.								
Item 3:	Str	Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	12/12 = 100%	0	8			
Item 4:	ANI	Risk of harm to child(ren)	18/20 =90	2/20 = 10%	0			
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.								
Item 5:	ANI*	Foster care re-entries	4/4 = 100%	0	6			
Item 6:	ANI	Stability of foster care placement	9/10 = 90%	1/10 = !0%	0			
Item 7:	ANI	Permanency goal for child	8/10 =80%	2/10 = 20%	0			
Item 8:	ANI	Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	2/4 = 50%	2/4 = 50%	6			
Item 9:	ANI	Adoption	1/5 = 20%	4/5 = 80%	5			
Item 10:	Str	Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	1/1=100%	0	9			
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.								
Item 11:	ANI	Proximity of foster care placement	7/9 = 78%	2/9 = 22%	1			
Item 12:	ANI	Placement with siblings	5/7 = 71%	2/7 = 29%	3			
Item 13:	ANI	Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	3/9 = 33%	6/9 = 67%	1			
Item 14:	ANI	Preserving connections	4/7 = 57%	3/7 = 43%	3			
Item 15:	ANI	Relative placement	3/10 = 30%	7/10 = 70%	0			
Item 16:	ANI	Relationship of child in care with parents	2/5 = 40%	3/5 = 60 %	5			
	Wel	Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity	to provide for the	eir children's needs.				
Item 17:	ANI	Needs and services of child, parents, caregiver	7/20 = 35%	13/20 = 65%	0			
Item 18:	ANI	Child and family involvement in case planning	1/17 = 6%	16/17 = 94%	3			
Item 19:	ANI	Worker visits with child	14/20 = 70%	6/20 = 30	0			
Item 20:	ANI	Worker visits with parent(s)	1/15 = 7%	14/15 = 93%	5			
		• • • •		1				
Item 21:	ANI	Educational needs of the child	5/12 = 42%	7/12 =58%	8			
Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.								
Item 22:	ANI	Physical health of the child	14/20 = 70%	6/20 = 30%	0			
Item 23:	ANI	Mental health of the child	10/14 = 71%	4/14 = 29%	6			
		the to 250/ of a constant of the control "Stress of 1."						

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