During the week of August17 - 22, 2009, a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in McCormick 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, McCormick DSS supervisors and workers, representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

#### Period under Review: August 1, 2008 to July 17, 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, Foster Care, Managed Treatment Services (MTS), and Adoptions.

The review is **qualitative** because it assesses the quality of the services rendered and the effectiveness of those services. The review seeks to explain why a county's performance data looks the way it does.

# Ratings

The standard that must be met for all items reviewed onsite is 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:** 

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

objective. 10070 m <= 24 hours (state law)							
	Number of	Number of	Percent of	Numbers of			
	Determinations	Investigations	Investigations	Investigations Above			
		Initiated Timely	Initiated Timely	(Below) Objective			
State	17,625	17,291	98.10%	-334			
McCormick	18	18	100%	0			

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

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all (100%) accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. Agency data indicates that for the 12 month period under review, McCormick County initiated all of its investigations of alleged abuse and neglect within 24 hours. Reviewers found that risk ratings were assigned appropriately in all cases.

<b>Onsite Review Fin</b>	ndings					
Safety Item 2: Re	epeat Malt	reatment				
			Area Needing			
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	100%	0	0	0	0
Treatment	4	100%	0	0	0	0
Total Cases	12	100%	0	0	0	0

#### **Explanation of Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment**

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. This item measures the occurrence of maltreatment among children under agency supervision, or within a year of having their case being closed by the agency. Because of the relatively small number of clients, reviewers were able to evaluate all open child welfare cases and all cases closed during the period under review. None of those children experienced maltreatment while under the agency's protective supervision.

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
s) services to raining to protect children and prevent removal	Strength
4) Risk of Harm	Strength
/	8

<b>Onsite Review Fin</b>	ndings					
Safety Item 3: Se	rvices to Fa	umily to Prote	ect Children i	n Home and Pr	event Remov	al
			Area Needing			
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	100%	0	0	0	0
Treatment	4	100%	0	0	0	0
Total Cases	12	100%	0	0	0	0

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

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. This item assesses whether services were adequate to protect children in their home and prevent their removal and placement into foster care. This was an area of strength in all of the cases reviewed. Assessments were thorough; safety plans were practical and monitored by case workers to ensure compliance.

<b>Onsite Review Fin</b>	ndings					
Safety Item 4: Ri	sk of Harm					
			Area Needing			
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	100%	0	0	0	0
Treatment	4	100%	0	0	0	0
Total Cases	12	100%	0	0	0	0

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

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. This item assesses whether the agency's interventions reduced risk of harm to children. This was area of strength in all of the cases reviewed. Cooperation and communication between agency partners allowed the agency to quickly respond to changes in a family's situation to ensure the safety of the children under agency supervision.

**Stakeholder Comments:** "The agency is very effective at keeping children safe. The agency does not wait to remove children when safety issues exist. The agency removes the children immediately."

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:

		0	
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	Strength	
10)	Permanency goal of Alternate Planned	No Rating	3
	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: June 1, 2008 to May 31, 2009

**Objective:** 90.1% (Federal Standard)

Objective: 90.1% (Federal Standard)							
	Number of Foster	Number of Children	Percent of Children	Number of			
	Children Reunified	Who Did Not	Who Did Not	Children			
	during Reporting	Re-enter Foster Care	<b>Re-Enter Foster</b>	Above			
	Period	Within 12 Months	Care Within 12	(Below)			
			Months	Objective			
State	2,964	2,714	91.57%	43.4			
McCormick	1	1	100%	0.1			

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

This is area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. This item measures the frequency of children reentering foster care within a year of discharge. The federal standard for this measure is that at least 90.1% of children entering foster care not be re-entries within a year of discharge from care. Agency data shows that no children re-entered foster care during the period under review.

# **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.

<b>Objective:</b> $>= 8$	6% (federal standard)			
	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	3,991	3,052	76.47%	-168.7
McCormick	10	9	90%	0.4

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

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. This item measures the frequency of placement changes for children in foster care, and assesses the reasons for those changes. The standard applied to this item is that at least 86% of children in care experience two or fewer placements during the period under review. Agency data shows that 90% of the children in

foster care experienced two or fewer placements. The dashboard measure differs from onsite reviewer findings because reviewers identified cases of children in placements that appeared to be at risk because of the child's disruptive behavior and lack of supportive intervention by the agency. However, those placements did not disrupt.

<b>Onsite Review Fin</b>	ndings						
Permanency Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child							
			Area Ne	eeding			
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	8	100%	0	0	0	0	

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

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness of permanency goals for children in foster care and the timeliness of those permanency decisions. All of the cases (100%) were strong in this area because all of the cases had appropriate permanency plans and there were no avoidable delays in the decisions to establish those plans.

# **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?

Report Period: June 1, 2008 to May 31, 2009

**Objective:** >= 75.2% (federal standard)

Objective: >= 75.2% (rederal 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	2,505	1,877	74.93%	-6.8			
McCormick	4	4	100%	1.0			

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

This is area of **Strength** for McCormick 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 all of the children who were returned home during the period under review, returned within a year of entering foster care. Reviewers found that the families of children in foster care with the plan of "Return Home" were receiving the services and support needed to resolve the safety issues and make the child's return home possible.

# **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:

<b>Objective:</b> $>= 36.6\%$ (National 75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile)						
	Total Number	Number of	Percent of Adoptions	Number of		
	of Finalized	Adoptions finalized	Finalized < 24	Children Above		
	Adoptions	< 24 months	months	(Below) Objective		
State	515	102	19.81%	-86.5		
McCormick	3	1	33.33%	-0.1		

#### Explanation of Item 9: Adoption

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. This item evaluates the process within the child welfare system to achieve timely adoptions for children in foster care. The federal standard is that at least 36.6% of adoptions be completed within 24 months of a child entering care. Although McCormick County falls short of this standard by 3.3 percentage points, the county finalized three adoptions during the period under review. That is an extraordinary accomplishment for a county with only 8 children in foster care.

Onsite Review Fi	ndings					
Permanency Item	10: Perman	ency Goal o			anent Living A	rrangement
			Area N	leeding		
	Strength		Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	0	0	0	0	8	0

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

This item evaluates the appropriateness and effectiveness of services provided to children with the permanency plan of APPLA. **NO RATING**. None of the foster children managed by this county had the plan of APPLA. All of the children were returned home, placed with relatives, or placed for adoption.

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 Strength 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: July 3, 2008 to July 2, 2009

**Objective:** >= 70% (Agency established objective)

Objective. 2	>= 70% (Agency establ	lislieu Objective)		
	Total Number of	Number of	Percent of	Number of Children
	Children<18 and in	Children	Children	Above
	care during report	Placed in	Placed in	(Below) Objective
	period	County of	County of	
		Origin	Origin	
State	6,133	4,155	67.75%	-138.1
McCormick	13		53.85%	-2.1

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

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick 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. Agency data shows that 7 of the 13 children (53.33%) managed in foster care during the period under review were placed within the county. This fell short of the 70% objective established by the agency. Reviewers found that the reasons for placing children outside of the county were sound. For example, a sibling group of three was placed in a group home in Laurens County so that they could remain together. Other youth were placed in an adjacent county because their behaviors required a therapeutic placement.

Onsite Review Findings							
Permanency Item 12: Placement with Siblings							
	Area Needing						
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	plicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	5	100%	0	0	3	0	

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

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep siblings together when it is appropriate to do so. All sibling groups were kept together whenever this was possible. One sibling group of three was placed out-of-county in a group home that could manage their behaviors because the children could not be managed within the county's foster homes.

Onsite Review Findings							
Permanency Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care							
		Area Needing					
	Stre	ngth	Improv	ement	Not App	licable	
	# % # %		%	#	%		
Foster Care	6	86	1	14%	1	0	

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to ensure that visits occur between children in foster care and their siblings and parents. In most of the cases (86%) reviewed, visits were happening with the mothers and siblings that were placed separately. This was an area needing improvement in 14% of the cases reviewed. In those cases, the agency failed to contact the fathers of children to determine whether visits should or should not occur.

Onsite Review Findings							
Permanency Item 14: Preserving Connections							
		Area Needing					
	Stre	ngth	Improv	ement	Not App	licable	
	#	# % # % # 9				%	
Foster Care	2	33%	4	67%	2	0	

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick 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 67% of the cases reviewed, the agency did not support the efforts of children in care to maintain contact with relatives who were identified as important to the children.

Onsite Review Findings							
Permanency Item 15: Relative Placement							
		Area Needing					
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Ap	oplicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	3	38%	5	62%	0	0	

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to identify and assess relatives as potential placement resources for children in foster care. In 62% of the foster care cases, the agency did not identify and assess both maternal and paternal relatives as a potential placement resource.

Onsite Review Findings								
Permanency Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents								
		Area Needing						
	Stre	ngth	Improv	vement	Not Applicable			
	#	# % # % # %				%		
Foster Care	0	0	4	100	4	4		

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick 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 every case reviewed caseworkers failed to support the level of contact needed to maintain the child's relationship with the parent to whom the agency planned to return the child.

# 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 A
- 18) Child and family involvement in case planning
- 19) Worker visits with child
- 20) Worker visits with parents

- Area Needing Improvement Area Needing Improvement Strength
- **Area Needing Improvement**

Onsite Review Findings								
Well Being Item 17: Needs and Services of Child, Parents, Foster Parents								
			Area Needing					
	Strength		Impro	ovement	Not Applicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Foster Care	6	75%	2	25	0	0		
Treatment	4	100%	0 0		0	0		
Total Cases	10	83%	2	17%	0	0		

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick 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 an area of strength in all of the in-home treatment cases. However, in 25% of the foster care cases reviewed there was no evidence that the needs and services for fathers were being assessed.

Onsite Review Findings								
Well Being Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning								
			Area l	rea Needing				
	Strength		Impro	rovement No		plicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Foster Care	2	33%	4	67%	2	0		
Treatment	4	100%	0	0	0	0		
Total Cases	6	60%	4	40%	2	0		

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. This was an area of strength for all of the in-home treatment cases. Reviewers found that 67% of the foster cases needed improvement because fathers were not included in case planning. The agency did not have a process of documenting its efforts to look for, engage and offer services to the fathers of children in care. When interviewed as part of this review one set of stakeholders said of the agency, "They tell them [the parents] what they have to do on the case plan and provide them a copy of the plan."

# **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:

<b>Objective:</b> >= 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		Month	Objective				
Foster Care	7	7	100%	16.5				
Treatment	9	8	88.89%	2.1				

# Explanation of Item 19: Worker Visits with Child

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with children under agency supervision, and evaluates the quality of those visits. Agency data indicates that all foster children were visited each month. One of the children in an in-home treatment case was not seen one month during the period under review. Reviewers found that caseworkers consistently addressed safety, well being and permanency issues during their face-to-face contacts with children.

# **Onsite Review Findings**

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

	Area Needing   Strength Improvement			Not Ap	Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	4	67%	2	33%	2	0	
Treatment	3	75%	1	25%	0	0	
Total Cases	7	70%	3	30%	2	0	

# **Explanation of Item 20: Worker Visits with Parents**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with parents, and evaluates the quality of those visits. This area needed improvement because in 30% of the cases the agency failed to engage the fathers of the children under agency supervision.

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

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

21) Educational need of the child

Strength

Onsite Review Findings									
Well Being Item 21: Educational Needs of Child									
			Area N	leeding					
	Stre	ength	Improv	vement	Not Ap	plicable			
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	4	100%	0	0	3	0			
Treatment	3 100%		0	0	1	0			
Total Cases	7	100%	0	0	4	0			

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

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and address the educational needs of children under agency supervision. Reviewers found that the educational needs of every child (100%) under the agency's protective supervision were well managed. The agency made direct contact with schools via telephone calls or school visits.

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 Strength

23) Mental health of the child

# **Onsite Review Findings**

Well Being Item 22: Physical Health of the Child									
		Area Needing Improvement							
	Stre	ngth			Not Applicable				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Foster Care	5	63	3	37%	0	0			
Treatment	4	100%	0	0	0	0			
Total Cases	9	75%	3	25%	0	0			

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and attend to the physical and dental health needs of children under agency supervision. This was an area of strength for all of the in-home treatment cases. In 37% of the foster care cases there no evidence that the children received required dental services.

#### **Onsite Review Findings**

Well Being Item 23: Mental Health of the Child

Wein Deing Rein 201 Weinter Heuten of the enne							
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	6	100%	0	0	2	0	
Treatment	4	100%	0	0	0	0	
Total Cases	10	100%	0	0	2	0	

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

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick 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 treatment cases and the foster care cases reviewed the mental health needs were assessed and met.

# Unfounded Investigations

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

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

This is area of **Strength** for McCormick 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. The assessments were thorough in all five of the cases reviewed and supported the case decision to unfound.

Screened Out	Intakes		
	Yes	No	Cannot Determine
Was the Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	2	0	0
			Not Applicable
Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?	2	0	0

# Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?200Were Appropriate Referrals Made?002

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

This is an area of **Strength** for McCormick 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 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 Needing Improvement** for McCormick DSS. This item evaluates the process by which the agency insures that all foster homes comply with the licensing requirements. There was one foster home license that was not valid.

McCormick County DSS Summary Sheet					
			Perf	ormance Item Ratin	gs
Performance Item or Outcome			Strength	Area Needing Improvement	N/A*
		Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, p	rotected from abu	se and neglect.	
Item 1:	Str	Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	10/10 = 100%	0	2
Item 2:	Str	Repeat maltreatment	12/12 = 100%	0	0
	Safety (	Dutcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their ho	mes whenever po	ssible and appropriate	
Item 3:	Str	Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	9/9 =100%	0	3
Item 4:	Str	Risk of harm to children	12/12 = 100%	0	0
	Pe	rmanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency an		living situations.	
Item 5:	Str	Foster care re-entries	8/8 = 100%	0	0
Item 6:	Str*	Stability of foster care placement	4/8 = 50%	4/8 = 50%	0
Item 7:	Str	Permanency goal for child	8/8 = 100%	0	0
Item 8:	Str	Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	6/6 =100%	0	2
Item 9:	Str	Adoption	1/2 = 50%	1/2 = 50%	4
Item 10:	N/A	Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	0	0	8
	Permanen	cy Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships		. *	en.
Item 11:	Str*	Proximity of foster care placement	6/7 = 86%	1/7 = 14%	1
Item 12:	Str	Placement with siblings	5/5 =100%	0	3
Item 13:	ANI	Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	6/7 = 86%	1/7 = 14%	1
Item 14:	ANI	Preserving connections	2/6 = 33%	4/6 = 67%	2
Item 15:	ANI	Relative placement	3/8 = 38%	5/8 =62%	0
Item 16:	ANI	Relationship of child in care with parents	0	4/4 = 100%	4
	Well	Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity	to provide for the	ir children's needs.	
Item 17:	ANI	Needs and services of child, parents, caregiver	10/12 = 83%	2/12 =- 17%	0
Item 18:	ANI	Child and family involvement in case planning	6/10 = 60%	4/10 = 40%	2
Item 19:	Str*	Worker visits with child	11/12 = 92%	1/12 = 8%	0
Item 20:	ANI	Worker visits with parent(s)	7/10 = 70%	3/10 = 30%	2
	We	Il Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate serv	vices to meet their	educational needs	•
Item 21:	Str	Educational needs of the child	11/11 = 100%	0	1
	Well Being	g Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to n	neet their physical	and mental health ne	eds.
Item 22:	ANI	Physical health of the child	10/12 =63%	3/12 = 37%	0
Item 23:	Str	Mental health of the child	10/10 = 100%	0	2

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