During the week of July 12-16, 2010, a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Marion 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, foster child, Marion DSS supervisors and workers, representative from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health, Family Court Judge, Law Enforcement and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

Period under Review: July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010

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
- 2) Repeat Maltreatment

Strength Strength

Agency Data

Performance Measure 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations on Reports of Child

Maltreatment - Of all reports of child maltreatment that were accepted for investigation during the reporting period, what percentage had a dictation type contact of initial contact where the action date is within 24 hours of accepting the report?

Report Period: 05/1/ 2009 to 04/30/ 2010

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

Objective: 100% II	$1 \le 24$ Hours (state)	law)		
	Number of	Number of	Percent of	Numbers of
	Determinations	Investigations	Investigations	Investigations
		Initiated Timely	Initiated Timely	Above (Below)
				Objective
State	18,930	18,424	97.3.%	-506
Marion	216	215	99.5%	-1

Explanation of Item 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations

This is an area of **Strength** for Marion 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 Marion initiated 215 of its 216 investigations (99.5%) of alleged abuse and neglect within 24 hours. Reviewers determined that all investigations were initiated timely. The one investigation that appeared to be late was due to a date entry error. Reviewers also found that risk ratings were assigned accurately.

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

Explanation of Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment

This is an area of **Strength** for Marion 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 100% of the foster care cases and 90% of the treatment cases reviewed, there was no additional maltreatment. The children in 5% of the cases experienced additional maltreatment because the agency failed to act decisively when risk factors were identified.

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 Strength
- 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 N	leeding		
	Stren	ıgth	Improv	vement	Not App	olicable
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	100	0	0	8	0
Treatment	10	100	0	0	0	0
Total Cases	12	100	0	0	8	0

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Marion DSS. This item assesses whether services were adequate to protect children in their home and prevent their removal and placement into foster care. In 100% of the treatment cases, appropriate services were being offered to safely maintain the children in their home when it was appropriate to do so. In every foster care case, the decision to remove the child was correct.

Onsite Review Findings

Safety Item 4: Risk of Harm

Safety Item 4. Kis						
			Area Ne	eeding		
	Stren	gth	Improv	ement	Not App	licable
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	0
Total Cases	15	75	5	25	0	0

Explanation of Item 4: Risk of Harm

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marion DSS. This item assesses whether the agency's interventions reduced risk of harm to children. Although none of the children in foster care were at risk of harm, risk was not well managed for 50% of the children in in-home treatment cases. In those cases the agency failed to complete background checks and assessments on all adults in the home who had an active role in the children's lives. Workers did not act decisively when risk factors were identified.

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

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

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

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.

Report Period: 05/01/09 to 04/30/10

Objective: 90.1% (Federal Standard)

Objective: 70.170	(rederar Standard)			
	Number of Foster	Number of	Percent of Children	Number of
	Children	Children Who	Who Did Not	Children
	Reunified	Did Not Re-enter	Re-Enter Foster Care	Above
	during Reporting	Foster Care	Within 12 Months	(Below)
	Period	Within 12 Months		Objective
State	2957	2734	92.5%	69.7
Marion	45	42	93.3%	1.5

Explanation of Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries

This is an area of **Strength** for Marion DSS. This item measures the frequency of children reentering foster care within a year of discharge. To meet the objective for this item, 90.1% of children must not re-enter foster care within a year of discharge. Agency data shows that fortytwo (93.3%) of the 45 children who entered foster care during the period under review had not been in foster care in the previous 12 months.

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.

Report Period: 0	5/01/09 to 04/30/10

Objective: $>= 8$	6% (Federal Standard)			
	Foster Care Services	Number with	Percent with No	Number
	Open $>$ 7 days and $<$	No More than 2	More than 2	Above (Below)
	12 months	Placements	Placements	Objective
State	3682	2771	75.3%	-395.5
Marion	63	51	81.0%	-3.2

Explanation of Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marion 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 81% of Marion DSS children had two or fewer placements; this is below the established objective. The foster parents complained that they did not receive the

support that they needed from the agency to care for the children in their homes. Some foster parents were not able to access day care services. Others were not provided information about the services the foster children in their home were receiving.

Onsite Review Findings

Permanency Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child

			Area Ne	eeding		
	Stren	gth	Improve	ement	Not App	olicable
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	0

Explanation of Item 7: Permanency Goal for Children

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marion DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness of permanency goals for children in foster care and the timeliness of those permanency decisions. Reviewers determined that 90% of the children in foster care, the agency quickly identified the appropriate permanency goal. In one case, the agency disregarded its long history with a mother whose other children had been removed from the home, and gave the most recent child entering care the unrealistic plan of "Return Home."

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, what percentage were reunified in less than 12 months from the date of the latest removal from home? Report Period: 05/01/09 to 04/30/09

Objective: >= 75.2% (Federal Standard
--

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	2485	1884	75.8%	15.3		
Marion	36	33	91.7%	5.9		

Explanation of Item 8: Reunification or Permanent Placement with Relatives

This is an area of **Strength** for Marion 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 91.7% of Marion DSS children were reunified with their parents within a year of removal, which surpasses the 75.2% federal standard.

Agency Data

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

Report Period: 05/01/09 to 04/30/09

Objective: >= 36.6% (National 75th Percentile)

	0.0% (National 75° Tercentile)					
	Total Number	Number of	Percent of	Number of		
	of Finalized	Adoptions finalized	Adoptions	Children Above		
	Adoptions	< 24 months	Finalized < 24	(Below)		
			months	Objective		
State	528	95	18.0%	-98.2		
Marion	4	0	0.0%	-1.5		

Onsite Review Findings

Permanency Item 9: Adoption

	Area Needing			eeding		
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	60	2	40	5	0

Explanation of Item 9: Adoption

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marion DSS. This item evaluates the process within the child welfare system to achieve timely adoptions for children in foster care. Agency data shows that Marion DSS completed four adoptions in SFY2009. However, none of the four adoptions were finalized within 24 months of the child entering care. Reviewers determined that three of the five children with the plan of adoption had already been in care for more than 24 months. The agency's determination to preserve the original family unit meant that it took the agency more than two years to change a child's plan from Return Home to Adoption.

Onsite Review Findings								
Permanency Item 10: Permanency Goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement								
	Area Needing							
	Stren	gth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	plicable		
	# % # % # %							
Foster Care	3	100	0	00	7	0		

Explanation of Item 10: Permanency Goal of APPLA

This is an area of **Strength** for Marion 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. In all of the cases reviewed, the agency attempted to find an adult who was committed to supporting the child as he grew into adulthood.

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

Strength Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement

Agency Data

Performance Measure 13: Foster Children Placed in 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?

Report Period: 06/02/09 to 06/01/10

Objective: >= 70% (Agency established objective)							
	Total Number of	Number of	Percent of	Number of			
	Children<18 and in	Children Placed	Children	Children Above			
	care during report	in County of	Placed in	(Below)			
	period	Origin	County of Origin	Objective			
State	5935	4035	68.0%	-119.5			
Marion	98	79	80.6%	10.4			

Explanation of Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement

This is an area of **Strength** for Marion 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 80.6% of Marion DSS children were placed within the county which surpasses the established objective.

Onsite Review Findings								
Permanency Item 12: Placement with Siblings								
	Area Needing							
	Stren	gth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	plicable		
	# % # % # %							
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 Marion DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep siblings together when it is appropriate to do so. In 71% of the cases reviewed, sibling groups were kept together when appropriate. In two of the cases reviewed children were placed separately because of a lack of foster care resources, not because of the needs of the children.

Onsite Review Findings							
Permanency Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care							
			Area Ne	eeding			
	Stre	ngth	Improv	ement	Not Ap	plicable	
# % # % # %							
Foster Care	4	44	5	56	1	0	

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marion DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to ensure that visits occur between children in foster care and their siblings and parents. Improvement was needed in 56% of the cases because the agency either failed to arrange visits between children and their non-custodial fathers or failed to assess the appropriateness of such visits. There was also a lack of diligent search for the fathers and failure by the agency to arrange visitation with siblings.

Onsite Review Findings							
Permanency Item 14: Preserving Connections							
			Area Ne	eeding			
	Stre	ngth	Improv	ement	Not Ap	plicable	
	# % # % # %						
Foster Care	4	50	4	50	2	0	

Explanation of Item 14: Preserving Connections

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marion 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 50% of the cases reviewed, the agency did not give attention to the relationships that were important to the child. The case records showed that the children were not visiting or communicating with grandparents or paternal relatives, even when the child had previously lived with those relatives.

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

Explanation of Item 15: Relative Placement

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marion DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to identify and assess relatives as potential placement resources for children in foster care. In 70% of the cases reviewed, the agency did not look for or assess maternal and paternal relatives as placement options. This item was also impacted by the agency's lack of diligent search for the fathers.

Onsite	Review	Findings

Permanency Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents								
Area Needing								
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable			
	#	# %		%	#	%		
Foster Care	2	2 40 3 60 5 0						

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marion 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 the visitation plans were exactly the same, without regard for the age of the child, the permanency plan or any other factor that should have been considered.

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

Onsite Review Findings									
Well Being Item 17: Needs and Services of Child, Parents, Foster Parents									
Area Needing									
	Stre	ngth	Improvement		Not Ap	plicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	0			
Treatment	4	40	6	60	0	0			
Total Cases	13	65	7	35	0	0			

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marion 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 was a relatively strong area for foster care cases. However, in 60% of the treatment cases reviewed, needs and services of the child and parents were not adequately assessed. In most of the cases that needed improvement the agency failed to assess the parents, paramours, age-appropriate children and non-custodial parents' needs. The agency failed to communicate with non-custodial fathers even when the agency knew their whereabouts. In treatment cases, the agency failed to assess the alternative caregiver.

Area Needing Improvement

Area Needing Improvement

Area Needing Improvement

Area Needing Improvement

Onsite Review Findings								
Well Being Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning								
Area Needing								
	Stren	gth	Improvement		Not Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Foster Care	5	71	2	29	3	0		
Treatment	9	90	1	10	0	0		
Total Cases	14	82	3	18	3	0		

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marion DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. Reviewers found that 29% of the foster care cases and 10% of the treatment cases needed improvement because the parents and the age-appropriate children were not involved in the case planning process. This rating was affected by the agency's failure to diligently look for and engage the fathers of children in care. This rating was also affected by the lack of diligent search and consistent follow-up by the agency with the parents even when they had knowledge of their whereabouts.

Agency Data

Performance Measure 14: 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?

Report Period: 05/01/09 to 04/30/10

Objective: >=	Objective: >= 100% (Agency established objective)							
	Number of Children	Number of	Percent of	Number of				
	Under Agency	Children visited	Children	Children Above				
	Supervision at least One	Every Month	Visited Every	(Below)				
	complete Calendar	-	Month	Objective				
	Month							
Foster Care	96	92	95.8%	257.9				
Treatment	390	322	82.6%	70.8				

Explanation of Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marion 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 require that children under agency supervision be seen each month. Agency data shows that 95.8% of the foster children in foster care and 82.6% of the children in in-home treatment cases were visited monthly.

Onsite Review Findings									
Well Being Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents									
			Area N	leeding					
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable				
	#	%	# %		#	%			
Foster Care	3	60	2	40	5	0			
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0	0			
Total Cases	10	67	5	33	5	0			

Explanation of Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marion DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with parents, and evaluates the quality of those visits. Improvement was needed in 40% of the foster care cases and 30% of the treatment cases due to the agency's failure to visit both parents during the period under review, especially when the plan was to return the child home to their parents. Reviewers noted that caseworkers did consistently use their visits with the parents to discuss treatment or permanency related topics, but failed to follow up on relevant findings, or to pursue diligent search for missing fathers. Also, once information was obtained on the fathers by the agency, there was a lack of follow-up to use the information to contact the fathers.

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	leeding				
	Strength		Improv	vement	Not Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Foster Care	5	83	1	17	4	0		
Treatment	6	86	1	14	3	0		
Total Cases	11	85	2	15	7	0		

13

Explanation of Item 21: Educational Needs of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marion DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and address the educational needs of children under agency supervision. In 83% of the foster care cases and in 86% of the treatment cases reviewers found that workers made direct contact with the school and there were also copies of grade reports and attendance records in the files. This item failed to achieve the 95% objective because of cases in which the agency failed to follow-up on information that indicated that the child needed assistance with some education-related issue. Also in the treatment cases, the worker assessed the needs of the victim child but ignored the needs of the other children in the home.

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						
	Strength		Improv	vement	Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	7	70	3	30	0	0	
Treatment	4	40	6	60	0	0	
Total Cases	11	55	9	45	0	0	

Explanation of Item 22: Physical Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marion DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the medical needs of children under agency supervision. In 70% of the foster care cases and in 40% of the treatment cases, the physical health and dental needs of the children were assessed and the identified medical needs were addressed. Copies of medical, dental and immunizations records were in most of the cases. In the cases that needed improvement, the agency failed to communicate with service providers to confirm that the medical or dental needs of the children were being met.

Onsite Review Findings								
Well Being Item 23: Mental Health of the Child								
			Area N	leeding				
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Foster Care	4	67	2	33	4	0		
Treatment	4	57	3	43	3	0		
Total Cases	8	62	5	38	7	0		

Explanation of Item 23: Mental Health of the Child

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marion DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the mental health needs of children under agency supervision. In 67% of the foster care cases and 57% of the treatment cases, the children's mental health needs were assessed and met. However, this fell short of the 95% objective because children did not consistently receive services called for in their mental health assessments nor did the agency follow-up or obtain medical records on the identified services that the children received.

Unfounded Investigations						
Onsite Review Findings	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 Investigation

This is an area of **Strength** for Marion 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. In 100% of the cases reviewed, the assessment was adequate and the decision to unfound was appropriate.

Screened Out Intakes						
Onsite Review Findings	Yes	No	Cannot Determine			
Was Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	10	0	0 Not Applicable			
Were necessary Collaterals Contacted?	8	2	0			
Were Appropriate Referrals made?	0	1	9			

Explanation of Item 25: Screened Out Intakes

This is an area of **Strength** for Marion 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 10 of the intakes were appropriately screened out and the necessary collaterals were contacted in 8 of the 10 cases reviewed regarding the reported allegations.

Foster Home Licenses

Explanation of Item 26: Foster Home Licenses

This is an area of **Strength** for Marion DSS. This item evaluates the process by which the agency ensures that all foster homes comply with licensing requirements. All foster home licenses were valid. The quarterly visits were conducted and being completed consistently as required. The records were set up according to policy. Documentation in the hard files and in CAPSS was consistent.

Marion County DSS Summary Sheet									
	Performance Item Ratings								
	Performance Item or Outcome	Strength	Area Needing Improvement	N/A*					
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.									
Item 1:* STR	Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	7/7=100%	0	13					
Item 2: STR	Repeat maltreatment	19/20=95%	1/20=5%	0					
Safety Ou	tcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes where	henever possible an	d 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)	15//20=75%	5/20=25%	0					
Permaner	ncy Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in	n their living situation	ons.						
Item 5: STR	Foster care re-entries	2/2=100%	0	8					
Item 6: *ANI	Stability of foster care placement	10/10=100%	0	0					
Item 7 ANI	Permanency goal for child	9/10=90%	1/10=10%	0					
Item 8: * STR	Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	3/3 = 100%	0	7					
Item 9: *ANI	Adoption	3/5=60%	2/5=40%	5					
Item 10: STR	Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	3/3=100%	0	7					
Perma	Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.								
Item 11: STR	Proximity of foster care placement	7/9=78%	2/9=12%	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	5/9=56%	4/9=44%	1					
Item 14: ANI	Preserving connections	4/8=50%	4/8=50%	2					
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					
	Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity	to provide for their	children's needs.	•					
Item 17: ANI	Needs and services of child, parents, caregiver	13/20=65%	7/20=35%	0					
Item 18: ANI	Child and family involvement in case planning	14/17=82%	3/17=18%	3					
Item 19: ANI	Worker visits with child	15/20=75%	5/20=25%	0					
Item 20: ANI	Worker visits with parent(s)	10/15=67%	5/15=33%	5					
Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.									
Item 21: ANI	Educational needs of the child	11/13=85%	2/13=15%	7					
Well I	Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to m	neet their physical a	nd mental health needs.						
Item 22: ANI	Physical health of the child	11/20=55%	9/20=45%	0					
Item 23: ANI	Mental health of the child	8/13=62%	5/13=8%	7					

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