During the week of March 31- April 3, 2009, a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Jasper 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, Jasper 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

Strength

| Agency Data | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Performance Measure 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations on Reports of Child | | | | | | | | | |
| Maltreatment | | · · | _ | | | | | | |
| Objective: 100% | in <= 24 hours (stat | e law) | | | | | | | |
| | Number of | Number of | Percent of | Numbers of | | | | | |
| | Determinations | Investigations | Investigations | Investigations | | | | | |
| | | Initiated Timely | Initiated Timely | Above (Below) | | | | | |
| | | | - | Objective | | | | | |
| State | 17,233 | 16,834 | 97.68% | (399) | | | | | |
| Jasper | 72 | 72 | 100% | 0 | | | | | |

Explanation of Item 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations

This is an area of **Strength** for Jasper DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. Agency data indicates that for the 12 month period under review, Jasper DSS initiated all of its investigations of alleged abuse and neglect within 24 hours. Reviewers found that the county office was appropriately assigning risk ratings to its investigations, and that investigations of high risk cases were initiated within two hours.

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

Explanation of Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment

This is an area of **Strength** for Jasper 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. In 95% of the cases reviewed the children experienced no additional maltreatment during the period under review.

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 **Area Needing Improvement**
- 4) Risk of Harm

Area Needing Improvement

| Onsite Review Findings | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--------------|-------------|----|--------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| Safety Item 3: Services to Family to Protect Children in Home and Prevent Removal | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Area Needing | | | | | | | | |
| | Stren | gth | Improvement | | Not Ap | plicable | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | | | | |
| Foster Care | 2 | 67 | 1 | 33 | 7 | 0 | | | | |
| Treatment | 10 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Total Cases | 12 | 92 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 0 | | | | |

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Jasper DSS. This item assesses whether services were adequate to protect children in their home and prevent their removal and placement into foster care. Although 92% of the cases reviewed were given a "Strength" rating, the county failed to meet the 95% compliance standard. The case causing the county to fall short of the standard involved a child who may have been able to remain in the home had the agency assessed and supported known relatives, to care for the child.

| Onsite Review Findings Softward A. Diele of Henry | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----|--------|----|----------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Safety Item 4: Risk of Harm Area Needing | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Strength | | Improv | • | 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 Jasper DSS. This item assesses whether the agency's intervention reduced risks of harm to children. Reviewers rated 30% of the treatment and 10% of the foster care cases as needing improvement. In the treatment cases, risk of harm to children in the home was not properly managed because the agency failed to complete criminal background checks and assessments on other adults and alternate caregivers who had an active role in the children's lives. In one foster care case, the child is placed in the licensed home of a relative, however the biological mother, who is not complying with the agency's treatment plan, continues to have unsupervised access to the child.

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:

| | unity is periorinality on this outcome is outstand in the rateing | , 01 5111 10011151 |
|-----|---|---------------------------------|
| 5) | Foster care re-entries | Strength |
| 6) | Stability of foster care placement | Strength |
| 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, the percent that did not reenter foster care within 12 months of the date of their discharge.

Objective: $\geq 90.1\%$ (National 25th percentile)

Report Period: February 1, 2008 – January 31, 2009

| | tepotot offour forwary 1, 2000 tunious for 1, 2009 | | | | | | | | |
|--------|--|------------------|---------------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Number Children | Number of | Percent of Children | Number of | | | | | |
| | Reunified During | Children | Discharged Who Did | Children Above | | | | | |
| | Reporting Period | Discharged Who | Not Re-enter Foster | (Below) | | | | | |
| | | Did Not Re-enter | Care | Objective | | | | | |
| | | Foster Care | | | | | | | |
| State | 2,799 | 2,590 | 92.53% | 68.1 | | | | | |
| Jasper | 21 | 21 | 100% | 0 | | | | | |

Explanation of Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries

This is an area of **Strength** for Jasper 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 no children entered foster care during the period under review within a year of discharge from 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: | >= | 869 | % (| (fede | eral | star | ndard |) |
|-------------------|----|-----|-----|-------|------|------|-------|---|
| | | _ | | ~ | ~ | | , | Т |

| | Foster Care Services | Number with | Percent with | Number Above |
|--------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| | Open >7 days and < | No More than 2 | No More than 2 | (Below) |
| | 12 months | placements | placements | Objective |
| State | 3,883 | 2,912 | 74.99% | (221.6) |
| Jasper | 15 | 15 | 100% | 2.1 |

Explanation of Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placement

This is an area of **Strength** for Jasper 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 none of the children in foster care experienced more than two placements during the period under review.

| Onsite Review Findings | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|----------|---------|--------|---------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| Permanency Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Area No | eeding | | | | | | |
| | Stren | Strength | | ement | 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 Jasper 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 all of the foster care cases reviewed, 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?

| 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 | 2,576 | 1,947 | 75.58% | 52.0 | | | | | |
| Jasper | 4 | 4 | 100% | 1.0 | | | | | |

Explanation of Item 8: Reunification or Permanent Placement with Relatives

This is an area of **Strength** for Jasper DSS. This item evaluates the activities and processes necessary to accomplish the goal of reunification with caregivers or placement with relatives. This was an area of strength for all of the cases reviewed onsite. Agency data shows that all of the children who entered foster care during the period under review returned to parents or relatives within a year of entering care.

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: February 1, 2008 – January 31, 2009

| • | Number of | Number of Adoptions | Percent of Adoptions | Number of |
|--------|-----------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| | Adoptions | Finalized in < 24 | Finalized in < 24 | Adoptions |
| | Finalized | months | Months | Above (Below) |
| | | | | Objective |
| State | 503 | 107 | 21.27% | (77.1) |
| Jasper | 4 | 1 | 25.00% | (0.5) |

Explanation of Item 9: Adoption

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Jasper DSS. This item evaluates the process within the child welfare system to achieve timely adoptions for children in foster care. Agency data shows that Jasper County completed four adoptions within the past 12 months. That is commendable for a county with 21 children in foster care. However, only one of those adoptions was completed within 24 months of the child entering foster care.

| Onsite Review Findings | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|----------|---------|--------|--------------------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Permanency Item 10: Permanency Goal of A lternate P lanned P ermanent L iving A rrangement (APPLA) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Area No | eeding | | | | | | | |
| | Stren | Strength | | ement | Not A _l | pplicable | | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | | | | | |
| Foster Core | 2 | 100 | 0 | Λ | 7 | 0 | | | | | |

Explanation of Item 10: Permanency Goal of APPLA

This is an area of **Strength** for Jasper 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 all of the youth with the plan of APPLA received appropriate Independent Living services. One of the youth reviewed was 19 years old, pregnant and living with a foster parent who was committed to her long-term care.

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
 Area Needing Improvement

14) Preserving connections Strength

15) Relative placement Area Needing Improvement

16) Relationship of child in care with parents

Area Needing Improvement

| Onsite Review Findings | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----|--------|--------|--------|----------|--|--|
| Permanency Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement | | | | | | | | |
| | Area Needing | | | | | | | |
| | 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 Jasper DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep children close enough to their families so that essential relationships can be maintained. Over 60% of foster children managed by Jasper DSS are placed in either Beaufort or Colleton Counties. Consequently, the county did not meet the 70% in-county placement objective set by the agency. However, reviewers determined children placed in adjacent Beaufort County were placed close enough to their home communities to allow children to maintain their important relationships.

| Onsite Review Findings | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----|--------|--------|--------|----------|--|--|--|
| Permanency Item 12: Placement with Siblings | | | | | | | | | |
| | Area Needing | | | | | | | | |
| | Stren | gth | Improv | vement | Not Ap | plicable | | | |
| # % # % # % | | | | | | | | | |
| Foster Care | 7 | 87 | 1 | 13 | 2 | 0 | | | |

Explanation of Item 12: Placement with Siblings in Foster Care

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Jasper DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep siblings together when it is appropriate to do so. In 87% of the cases reviewed, sibling groups were kept together when appropriate based on their therapeutic needs. One case was rated needing improvement, because there was no documented reason as to why the child was separated from their other two siblings.

| Onsite Review Findings | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------|---------|--------|----------------|---|--|--|
| Permanency Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Area Ne | eeding | | | | |
| | Stre | Strength | | ement | Not Applicable | | | |
| | # | # % # | | | # | % | | |
| Foster Care | 9 | 90 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | | |

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** Jasper DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to ensure that visits occur between children in foster care and their siblings and parents. In 90% of cases reviewed, visits between children in foster care and their parents were occurring as required by policy. In those cases, visits were occurring among the siblings as well. One case needed improvement because there was no evidence of visits occurring between the child and both parents as required.

| Onsite Review Findings Permanency Item 14: Preserving Connections | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|-----|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Area Needing Strength Improvement Not Applicable | | | | | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | | |
| Foster Care | 10 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

Explanation of Item 14: Preserving Connections

This is an area of **Strength** for Jasper 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, the agency worked to keep children within or near their home communities, and to help children maintain their relationships with family and friends. There was evidence of the agency's efforts to keep children connected with their relatives in other states.

| Onsite Review Findings | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------|--------|--------|--------------------|-----------|--|--|
| Permanency Item 15: Relative Placement | | | | | | | | |
| | Area Needing | | | | | | | |
| | Stre | ngth | Improv | vement | Not A ₁ | oplicable | | |
| | % | | | | | | | |
| Foster Care | 8 | 89 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | | |

Explanation of Item 15: Relative Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Jasper DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to identify and assess relatives as potential placement resources for children in foster care. In 89% of the cases reviewed, reviewers found that the agency consistently assessed maternal and paternal relatives as placement options. The case needing improvement failed to assess the relatives of the non-custodial parent.

| Onsite Review Findings | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------|--------|--------|-------|------------|--|--|
| Permanency Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents | | | | | | | | |
| | Area Needing | | | | | | | |
| | Stre | ngth | Improv | vement | Not A | applicable | | |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | | |
| Foster Care | 6 | 86 | 1 | 14 | 6 | 3 | | |

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Jasper 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 14% of the cases reviewed, reviewers found no evidence of the agency's efforts in supporting the parent-child relationships beyond the minimum required twice a month visitation. Agency policy encourages additional relationship building activities especially when infants and preschool aged children are involved.

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 Needing | | | | | | | | |
| | Strength | | Improv | 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 17: Needs and Services of Child, Parents and Caregivers

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Jasper 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 10% of the foster care cases and 30% of the treatment cases reviewed, needs and services of the parents, caretakers and foster parents were not adequately assessed.

| Onsite Review Findings | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|----|-------|--------|----------------|---|--|--|--|
| Well Being Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning | | | | | | | | | |
| | Area Needing | | | | | | | | |
| | Strength | | Impro | 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 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Jasper DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. Although all appropriate parties were involved in case planning in 70% of the cases, there were areas needing improvement. In several foster care and treatment cases, the age-appropriate children, fathers and paramours were not actively engaged in the case planning process even if the agency had knowledge of their whereabouts.

| 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 Supervision | Children | Children Visited | Children Above | | | | | |
| | at Least One Complete | Visited Every | Every Month | or (Below) | | | | | |
| | Calendar Month | Month | | Standard | | | | | |
| Foster Care | 25 | 25 | 100.00% | 25.5 | | | | | |
| Treatment | 147 | 65 | 44.22% | (23.5) | | | | | |

Explanation of Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Jasper 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. During the period under review, every child in foster care had a face-to-face contact with

his caseworker each month. Agency data shows that 44.22% of the children in treatment cases in Jasper County were visited monthly. The content of all visits evaluated by reviewers was focused on relevant issues.

| Onsite Review Findings | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----|--------|---------|------------|---|--|--|--|
| Well Being Item 20: Worker Visits with Parent(s) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Area N | leeding | | | | | |
| | Strength | | Improv | vement | Applicable | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | | | |
| Foster Care | 6 | 86 | 1 | 14 | 3 | 0 | | | |
| Treatment | 9 | 90 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Total Cases | 15 | 88 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 0 | | | |

Explanation of Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Jasper DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with parents, and evaluates the quality of those visits. Although this was a well managed area in 88% of the cases, there was need for improvement in the remainder of the cases. In 12% of the cases, the county failed to diligently look for or consistently engage the fathers of children.

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 need of the child

Strength

| Onsite Review Findings | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-----|--------|---------|-------|------------|--|--|--|
| Well Being Item 21: Educational Needs of Child | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Area N | leeding | | | | | |
| | Strength | | Improv | vement | Not A | applicable | | | |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | | | |
| Foster Care | 8 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | |
| Treatment | 6 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | | | |
| Total Cases | 14 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | | | |

Explanation of Item 21: Educational Needs of the Child

This is an area of **Strength** for Jasper 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 and treatment cases reviewed. Reviewers determined that workers made direct contact with the school and there were copies of grade reports and attendance records in both foster care and treatment cases.

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

Strength

| Onsite Review Findings | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-----|--------|--------------|--------------|---|--|--|--|
| Well Being Item 22: Physical Health of the Child | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Area N | Area Needing | | | | | |
| | Strength | | Improv | vement | ment Not App | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | | | |
| Foster Care | 8 | 80 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Treatment | 10 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Total Cases | 18 | 90 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | | | |

Explanation of Item 22: Physical Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Jasper 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 100% of the treatment cases reviewed. Reviewers determined that the physical health and dental needs of the children were assessed and the identified medical needs were met. Copies of medical, dental and immunizations records were also in the cases. In 80% of the foster care cases reviewed, the physical health needs of the children were assessed and the identified medical needs were met. In two foster care cases there was no evidence that the children received required physical and dental examinations.

| Onsite Review Fire | ndings | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-----|--------------|---|----------------|---|--|
| Well Being Item 23: Mental Health of the Child | | | | | | | |
| | | | Area Needing | | | | |
| | Strength | | Improvement | | Not Applicable | | |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | |
| Foster Care | 8 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Treatment | 6 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | |
| Total Cases | 14 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | |

Explanation of Item 23: Mental Health of the Child

This is an area of **Strength** for Jasper DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the mental health needs of children under agency supervision. In 100% of the cases reviewed, the children's mental health needs were assessed and met. There were copies of mental health referrals for assessments and progress reports in both treatment and foster care cases.

| Unfounded Investigations | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|----|--|--|--|
| | Yes | No | | | |
| Investigation initiated timely? | 5 | 0 | | | |
| Was assessment adequate? | 4 | 1 | | | |
| Was decision appropriate? | 5 | 0 | | | |

Explanation of Item 24: Unfounded Investigations

This is an area of **Strength** for Jasper 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 and the decisions to unfound the cases appeared to be sound. One of the assessments was incomplete because the grandfather, who was the alleged perpetrator of sexual abuse against the 2-year-old child, was never interviewed. Even though the examination by the medical doctor could not determine whether sexual abuse occurred or not, the alleged perpetrator should have been interviewed before the case was unfounded.

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

Explanation of Item 25: Screened Out Intakes

This is an area of **Strength** for Jasper 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 determined that all five of the intakes were appropriately screened out and the necessary collaterals were contacted regarding the reported allegations.

Foster Home Licenses

Explanation of Item 26: Foster Home Licenses

This is an area of **Strength** for Jasper DSS. A review of licensing records showed some areas of strength, and many areas needing attention. There were no invalid foster home licenses.

The majority of licensing records showed many areas of strength and a few areas needing attention. The most common areas of concern include:

- Documentation in record not consistent with CAPSS;
- Sexual Offenders checks not consistently being completed on children 12 and older;
- Missing pet vaccination;
- Unable to locate the 3 references in most of the records.

| Jasper 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 a | abuse and neglect. | | | | |
| Item 1: *Str | Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment | 11/12=92% | 1/12=8% | 8 | | |
| Item 2: Str | Repeat maltreatment | 19/20=95% | 1/20=5% | 0 | | |
| Safety Out | come 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes wh | enever possible and | appropriate. | • | | |
| Item 3: ANI | Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal | 12/13=92% | 1/13=8% | 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 | | ns. | | | |
| Item 5: *Str | Foster care re-entries | 3/3=100% | 0 | 7 | | |
| Item 6: Str | Stability of foster care placement | 10/10=100% | 0 | 0 | | |
| Item 7: Str | Permanency goal for child | 10/10=100% | 0 | 0 | | |
| Item 8: Str | Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives | 5/5 =100% | 0 | 5 | | |
| Item 9: *ANI | Adoption | 0 | 1/1=100% | 9 | | |
| Item 10: Str | Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA) | 3/3= 100% | 0 | 7 | | |
| Permai | nency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships a | and connections is p | reserved for children. | | | |
| Item 11: Str | Proximity of foster care placement | 9/9= 100% | 0 | 1 | | |
| Item 12: ANI | Placement with siblings | 7/8=87% | 1/8=13% | 2 | | |
| Item 13: ANI | Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care | 9/10=90% | 1/10=10% | 0 | | |
| Item 14: Str | Preserving connections | 10/10=100% | 0 | 0 | | |
| Item 15: ANI | Relative placement | 8/9= 89% | 1/10=11% | 0 | | |
| Item 16: ANI | Relationship of child in care with parents | 6/7=86% | 1/7=14% | 3 | | |
| V | Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to | o provide for their c | hildren's needs. | | | |
| Item 17: ANI | Needs and services of child, parents, caregiver | 16/20=80% | 4/20=20% | 0 | | |
| Item 18: ANI | Child and family involvement in case planning | 14/20=70% | 6/20=30% | 0 | | |
| Item 19: ANI | Worker visits with child | 16/20=80% | 4/20=20% | 0 | | |
| Item 20: ANI | Worker visits with parent(s) | 15/17=88% | 2/17=12% | 3 | | |
| V | Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs. | | | | | |
| Item 21: Str | Educational needs of the child | 14/14=100% | 0 | 6 | | |
| Well B | Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs. | | | | | |
| Item 22: ANI | Physical health of the child | 18/20=90% | 2/20=10% | 0 | | |
| Item 23: Str | Mental health of the child | 14/14=100% | 0 | 6 | | |

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