During the week of January 12-16, 2009, a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Horry 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, Horry DSS supervisors; representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

## Period under Review: February 1, 2008 to February 28, 2009 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 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** 

2) Repeat Maltreatment

**Area Needing Improvement** 

Agency Data										
Performance Measure 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations on Reports of Child										
Maltreatment			_							
<b>Objective:</b> 100%	$6 \text{ in} \le 24 \text{ hours (s)}$	state law)								
	Number of	Number of	Percent of	Numbers of						
	Determinations	Investigations	Investigations	Investigations						
		Initiated Timely	Initiated Timely	Above (Below)						
			_	Objective						
State	17,852	17,216	96.44%	-636						
Horry	1095	1066	97.35%	-29						

### **Explanation of Item 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations**

This is an area of **Strength** for Horry DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all (100%) accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. Reviewers were able to determine that the 29 investigations that appeared to be late were actually initiated timely. The discrepancies were due to data entry errors.

# **Agency Data**

**Item 2: 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?

Report Period: 10/1/07 to 09/30/08

<b>Objective:</b> ≥ Agency Average									
	Number of	Number of	Percent of Treatment	Number of Cases					
	Treatment	Treatment Cases	Cases that did not	Above (Below)					
	Cases Closed	with no founded	have a new founded	State Average					
		intake within 12	intake within 12	_					
		months	months						
State	5,491	4,838	88.11%						
Horry	229	196	85.59 %	-5.8					

Onsite Review Findings									
Safety Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment									
	Area Needing								
	Stre	ngth	Improvement		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 2: Repeat Maltreatment**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item measures the occurrence of maltreatment among children under agency supervision. Reviewers found that 20% of the children under agency supervision experienced maltreatment during the period under review. Agency data shows that 14.41% of those incidents triggered new investigations that were indicated. The difference between those percentages suggests that some incidents of repeat maltreatment did not trigger new investigations.

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

Onsite Review Findings											
Safety Item 3: Se	ervices to Fan	nily to Protec	t Children in	Home and Pr	event Remov	al					
			Area Needing								
	Stre	ngth	Improvement		Not Applicable						
	#	%	#	%	#	%					
Foster Care	5	100	0	0	5	0					
Treatment	10	100	0	0	0	0					
Total Cases	15	100	0	0	5	0					

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Horry DSS. This item assesses whether services were adequate to protect children in their home and prevent their removal and placement into foster care. Reviewers determined that the decision to remove the children from their homes and place them in foster care was appropriate in every case. Reviewers found that the services needed to ensure the safety of the children who remained with their parents or relatives were also appropriate.

Onsite Review Findings Safety Item 4: Risk of Harm									
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0			
Treatment	7	30	3	30	0	0			
Total Cases	17	85	3	15	0	0			

#### **Explanation of Item 4: Risk of Harm**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item assesses whether the agency's intervention reduced risk of harm to children. Risk of harm was adequately managed in every foster care case. In 30% of the treatment cases, the agency failed to assess other adults in the home who had an active role in the children's lives, and failed to assess alternate caregivers. Also, there was a lack of diligent follow-up to address concerns once the child was placed with an alternative caregiver.

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
 Strength
 Area Needing Improvement
 Area Needing Improvement

8) Reunification or permanent placement with relatives **Strength** 

9) Adoption Area Needing Improvement

10) Permanency goal of Alternate Planned
Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)

Area Needing Improvement

## **Agency Data**

**Performance Measure 7: Foster Children Who do Not Re-enter Care** - Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification in the 12 month period prior to reporting period, what percentage did Not re-enter foster care within 12 months of the date of their discharge from the prior foster care episode.

Objective	Objective: 90.1% (Federal Standard)								
	Number of Foster Children Reunified during Reporting Period	Number of Children Who Did Not Re-enter Foster Care Within 12 Months	Percent of Children Who Did Not Re-enter Foster Care Within 12 Months	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective					
State	2729	2523	92.45%	64.2					
Horry	150	140	93.33%	4.9					

#### **Explanation of Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries**

This is area of **Strength** for Horry 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 shows that 93.33% of the children reunified with their families during the period under review 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, the percentage that had no more than two placement settings.

Objective: >= 86% (Federal Standard)								
	Foster Care Services	Number with No	Percent with No	Number				
	Open > 7 days and	More than 2	More than 2	Above				
	< 12 months	Placements	Placements	(Below)				
				Objective				
State	4034	3036	75.26%	-219.4				
Horry	239	190	79.50%	-15.5				

#### **Explanation of Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placement**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item measures the frequency of placement changes for children in foster care, and assesses the reasons for those changes. The objective for this item is that at least 86% of the children in care have two or fewer placements within 12 months. Agency data shows that 79.50% of Horry DSS children had two or fewer placements. The county had 100 foster homes to serve the 293 children in care. The foster homes available were not sufficient to meet the needs of older foster children and sibling groups.

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

#### **Explanation of Item 7: Permanency Goal for Children**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry 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 identified the appropriate goal timely. One case was rated an area needing improvement because the permanency goal of APPLA was established inappropriately for a child that was 12 years old.

## **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?

<b>Objective:</b> >= 75.2% (federal standard)									
	Number of Children   Number of Children   Percent of Children   Number o		Number of						
	Returned to	Returned to	Returned to	Children Above					
	Parents/Caretakers	Parents/Caretakers	Parents/Caretakers	(Below)					
		after in Care <12	after in Care < 12	Objective					
		months	months						
State	2570	1990	77.43%	57.4					
Horry	157	132	84.08%	13.9					

#### **Explanation of Item 8: Reunification or Permanent Placement with Relatives**

This is an area of **Strength** for Horry 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 84.08% of the children who entered care during the period under review returned to parents or relatives within one year of entering care. This exceeded the 75.2% requirement. Reviewers found that the children were returned home appropriately, without increasing the risk of harm to those children and without causing those children to re-enter care.

Onsite Review Findings								
Permanency Item 9: Length of Time to Achieve Adoption								
			Area No	eeding				
	Strength		Improvement		Not App	licable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Foster Care	1	50	1	50	8	0		

#### **Explanation of Item 9: Adoption**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the process within the child welfare system to achieve timely adoptions for children in foster care. The onsite review revealed that in 50% of the children with the plan of adoption had already been in care for more than 24 months. Reviewers saw delays in scheduling TPR hearing for fathers, which contributed to the permanency delay.

Onsite Review Findings									
Permanency Item 10 (APPLA)	: Permanency Goal	of Alternate Planned Perma	nent Living Arrangement						
		Area Needing							

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

#### **Explanation of Item 10: Permanency Goal of APPLA**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry 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 nonrelatives that were willing to commit to the youth's long-term care every six months. Reviewers found that in the one case reviewed there is no documentation to support that the child with the plan of APPLA was receiving the 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 Strength

12) Placement with siblings in foster care **Area Needing Improvement** 

13) Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care **Area Needing Improvement** 

Strength 14) Preserving connections

15) Relative placement **Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement** 

16) Relationship of child in care with parents

## **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 the county of origin?

Objective: >	Objective: >= 70 (Agency established objective)									
	Number of	Number of Children	er of Children Percent of							
	Children in	Placed <b>Within</b> County	Children Placed	Children Above						
	Foster Care	of Origin	Within County of	(Below)						
			Origin	Objective						
State	6243	4228	67.72%	-142.1						
Horry	379	304	80.21%	38.7						

Onsite Review Findings									
Permanency Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement									
			Area N	leeding					
	Stren	gth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	plicable			
	# % # % # %								
Foster Care	9	100	0	0	1	0			

#### **Explanation of Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement**

This is an area of **Strength** for Horry 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 that at least 70% of the children in care be placed within the county. Agency data shows that 80.21% of Horry DSS children were placed within the county. Reviewers found that children placed outside of the county were in placements to meet the children's needs, for example placement with relatives, placement in therapeutic facilities.

Onsite Review Findings								
Permanency Item 12: Placement with Siblings								
			Area N	leeding				
	Stren	gth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	plicable		
# % # % # %								
Foster Care	7	88	1	12	2	0		

#### **Explanation of Item 12: Placement with Siblings in Foster Care**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep siblings together when it is appropriate to do so. In 88% of the cases reviewed, sibling groups were kept together when appropriate. This was rated an area needing improvement because of one case in which a child was placed in a different home than his siblings, not because of the needs of that child, but because the agency did not have a placement that would care for all of the children.

Onsite Review Findings							
Permanency Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care							
	Area Needing						
	Stre	ngth	Improve	ement	Not Ap	plicable	
# % # % # %							
Foster Care	2	29	5	71	3	0	

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to ensure that visits occur between children in foster care and their siblings and parents. In 71% of the cases reviewed, visits between children in foster care and their parents were not occurring as required by policy. In most cases, reviewers found instances where visits were not scheduled or offered to the fathers and the visits scheduled with the mother were sporadic.

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

#### **Explanation of Item 14: Preserving Connections**

This is an area of **Strength** for Horry 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 100% of the cases reviewed, this was an area of strength because the agency worked to keep children within their same communities, and to help children maintain their relationships with family and friends.

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

#### **Explanation of Item 15: Relative Placement**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to identify and assess relatives as potential placement resources for children in foster care. In 40% of the cases reviewed, reviewers found that the agency did not attempt to identify, contact or assess the relatives of non-custodial parents.

Onsite Review Findings									
Permanency Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents									
			Area N	leeding					
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not A	pplicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	2	33	4	67	4	0			

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry 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 67% of the cases reviewed, caseworkers facilitated the minimum number of visits between children and parents, but failed to increase the frequency or duration of those visits based on the needs of the children. Additional contact should have been arranged for infants and pre-school aged children, and for children transitioning out of foster care back into their homes.

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

The county'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 N	leeding						
	Stre	Strength Improv		vement	Not A	plicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%				
Foster Care	7	70	3	3 30		0				
Treatment	3	30	7	70	0	0				
Total Cases	10	50	10	50	0	0				

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry 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 the

foster care cases and 70% of the treatment cases reviewed, needs and services of the parents, caretakers, and foster parents were not adequately assessed. The needs of alternate caregivers were often ignored in in-home treatment cases.

Onsite Review Findings										
Well Being Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning										
			Area N	leeding						
	Stre	ngth	Impro	vement	Not Applicable					
	#	%	#	%	#	%				
Foster Care	4	57	3 43		3	0				
Treatment	2	20	8	80	0	0				
Total Cases	6	35	11	65	3	0				

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. Onsite reviewers found that in 43% of the foster care cases and 80% of the treatment cases, parents, caregivers and the age appropriate children were not involved in the case planning process. In some of the foster care and treatment cases, the treatment plans were neither complete or current, and not signed by the parents. In some instances the caseworker appeared to be confused as to who should be included. For example, in a treatment case, the uncle and aunt were the primary caretakers and had physical and legal custody of the child but were not involved in case planning because the worker was working with the biological mother.

## **Agency Data**

Well Being Item 19: Face-to-Face Visits with Children (<18 years of age) Of all children in foster care and treatment for at least one full calendar month during the reporting period, what percentage of children had a documented face-to-face visit every full calendar month during the reporting period?

<b>Objective:</b> >= 90 (Agency established objective)								
	Number of Children	Number of	Percent of	Number of Children				
	Under Agency	Children	Children	Above				
	Supervision at least	visited Every	Visited Every	(Below) Objective				
	One complete	Month	Month					
	Calendar Month							
Foster Care	293	226	77.13%	-20.5				
Treatment	778	363	46.66%	-93.1				

#### **Explanation of Item 19: Worker Visits with Child**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry 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. Agency data shows that 77.13% of the foster children in foster care and 46.66% of the children in treatment were visited monthly. Reviewers found that, in some cases, when the visits were made, the content of the visits did not always address safety, permanency and child well being issues.

Onsite Review Findings									
Well Being Item 20: Worker Visits with Parent(s)									
			Area N	eeding					
	Stre	Strength Improvement			Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	0	0	5	100	5	0			
Treatment	1	10	9 90 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 Horry DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with parents, and evaluates the quality of those visits. This was an area needing improvement for almost every foster care and in-home treatment case because of the agency's failure to assess the viability of working with both parents. Even when the agency was working with parents, contact with the parents was often sporadic. Visits with parents did not consistently address the reason for the agency's involvement.

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									
			Area N	Area Needing					
	Strength		Improv	vement	Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	2	100	0 0		8	0			
Treatment	5	83	1	17	4	0			
Total Cases	7	88	1	12	12	0			

#### **Explanation of Item 21: Educational Needs of the Child**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry 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 100% of the foster care cases reviewed. Reviewers found that workers made direct contact with the school and there were also copies of grade reports and attendance records in both foster care and treatment cases. Reviewers determined that one of the treatment cases was rated an area needing improvement because there was no evidence that the educational needs were assessed.

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

**Area Needing Improvement** 

23) Mental health of the child

**Area Needing Improvement** 

Onsite Review Findings						
Well Being Item 22: Physical Health of the Child						
			Area Needing			
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	80	2	20	0	0
Treatment	4	40	6	60	0	0
Total Cases	12	60	8	40	0	0

#### **Explanation of Item 22: Physical Health of the Child**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the medical needs of children under agency supervision. This was an area of strength for 80% of the foster care and 40% of the in-home treatment cases. This area needed

improvement because of inconsistent attention to this area of service. There were cases that contained no assessment of medical needs. This was partly due to caseworker's frustration with the agency's assessment form.

Onsite Review Findings							
Well Being Item 23: Mental Health of the Child							
				Area Needing			
	Stre	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	4	80	1	0	5	0	
Treatment	3	43	4	57	3	0	
Total Cases	7	58	5	42	8	0	

#### **Explanation of Item 23: Mental Health of the Child**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the mental health needs of children under agency supervision. In 58% of the cases reviewed, the children's mental health needs were assessed and met. This area needed improvement because of inconsistent attention to this area of service. There were cases that contained no assessment of mental health needs and no reports from mental health providers.

Unfounded Investigations				
	Yes	No		
Was the investigation initiated timely?	5	0		
Was the assessment adequate?	5	0		
Was the decision adequate?	5	0		

#### **Explanation of Item 24: Unfounded Investigations**

This is an area of **Strength** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's investigative process and determines if decisions were supported by the facts of the cases. All investigations were initiated timely. The assessments were adequate and supported the case decision to unfound.

#### **Screened Out Intakes**

	Yes	No	<b>Cannot Determine</b>
Was the intake appropriately screened out?	8	0	2
	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Were necessary collateral contacts made?	4	4	$\overline{2}$
Were appropriate referrals made?	1	2	7

#### **Explanation of Item 25: Screened Out Intakes**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the process by which the agency screens out reports of abuse and/or neglect to determine if the intakes were appropriately screened out. Reviewers could not determine whether or not two reports were screened appropriately due to insufficient gathering of information from the reporter and a lack of follow-up with collaterals regarding the alleged incidents.

#### Foster Home Licenses

## **Explanation of Item 26: Foster Home Licenses**

This is an area of **Strength** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the process by which the agency ensures that all foster homes comply with licensing requirements. Reviewers found that there were no unlicensed foster homes and no foster homes with invalid licenses due to a failure to adhere to licensing requirements.

Horry County DSS Summary Sheet					
		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: Str	Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	10/10=100%	0	9	
Item 2: Str	Repeat maltreatment	18/19=95%	1/19=10%	0	
Safety Ou	tcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes where	henever possible an	d appropriate.	•	
Item 3: <b>Str</b>	Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	13/13=100%	0	6	
Item 4: Str	Risk of harm to child(ren)	19/19=100%	0	0	
Permaner	ncy Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in	n their living situation	ons.		
Item 5: Str	Foster care re-entries	1/1=100%	0	8	
Item 6: Str*	Stability of foster care placement	7/9=78%	2/9=22%	0	
Item 7: Str	Permanency goal for child	9/9=100%	0	0	
Item 8: Str	Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	1/1 = 100%	0	8	
Item 9: Str	Adoption	5/5=100%	0	4	
Item 10: ANI	Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	2/3=67%	1/3=33%	6	
Perma	nency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships	and connections is 1	preserved for children.		
Item 11: Str*	Proximity of foster care placement	9/9= 100%	0	0	
Item 12: Str	Placement with siblings	7/7=100%	0	2	
Item 13: <b>Str</b>	Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	7/7=100%	0	2	
Item 14: ANI	Preserving connections	3/9=33%	6/9=66%	0	
Item 15: ANI	Relative placement	5/9= 56%	4/9=44%	0	
Item 16: <b>Str</b>	Relationship of child in care with parents	3/3=100%	0	6	
1	Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity	to provide for their	children's needs.		
Item 17: Str	Needs and services of child, parents, caregiver	19/19=100%	0	0	
Item 18: ANI	Child and family involvement in case planning	14/18=78%	4/18=22%	1	
Item 19: Str	Worker visits with child	19/19=100%	0	0	
Item 20: Str	Worker visits with parent(s)	12/12=100%	0	7	
	Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate serv	ices to meet their ed	lucational needs.	•	
Item 21: Str	Educational needs of the child	14/14=100%	0	5	
Well E	Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to m	eet their physical ar	nd mental health needs.		
Item 22: Str	Physical health of the child	19/19=100%	0	0	
Item 23: ANI	Mental health of the child	12/14=86	2/14=14%	5	

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

ANI = Area Needing Improvement

 $\label{eq:January 2009} January \ 2009$  \* = Rating based on agency data, not onsite review findings