

South Carolina Department of Social Services
Child Welfare Quality Assurance Review: York County
Summary Report

This summary report describes the results of the South Carolina Department of Social Services (DSS) York County Quality Assurance Review, conducted March 10-14, 2014. The period under review was September 1, 2013 to February 28, 2014.

DSS Child Welfare Quality Assurance Reviews are conducted using the *Onsite Review Instrument* (OSRI) finalized by the federal Administration for Children & Families (ACF) in July 2008. This instrument is used to review foster care and family preservation services cases. Thirty cases were reviewed including 15 foster care and 15 family preservation cases.

The OSRI is divided into three sections: safety, permanency, and child and family well-being. There are two safety outcomes, two permanency outcomes, and three well-being outcomes. Reviewers collect information on a number of *items* related to each of the outcomes. The ratings for each *item* are combined to determine the rating for the outcome. Outcomes are rated as being substantially achieved, partially achieved, not achieved, or not applicable. The *items* are rated as *strength*, *area needing improvement*, or not applicable. Ratings for each of the outcomes are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. Child Welfare QA Onsite Reviews – Ratings by Outcome

Outcome	Substantially Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
Safety 1 <i>Children Are, First and Foremost, Protected from Abuse and Neglect</i>	100% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Safety 2 <i>Children are Safely Maintained in their Homes whenever Possible and Appropriate</i>	50% (15)	3% (1)	47% (14)
Permanency 1 <i>Children have Permanency and Stability in their Living Situations</i>	67% (10)	27% (4)	6% (1)
Permanency 2 <i>The Continuity of Family Relationships and Connections is Preserved for Children</i>	73% (11)	27% (4)	0% (0)
Well-Being 1 <i>Families have Enhanced Capacity to Provide for their Children's Needs</i>	27% (8)	60% (18)	13% (4)
Well-Being 2 <i>Children receive Appropriate Services to meet their Educational Needs</i>	82% (14)	6% (1)	12% (2)
Well-Being 3 <i>Children receive Adequate Services to meet their Physical and Mental Health Needs</i>	54% (14)	27% (7)	19% (5)

Results for outcomes and *items* are reported by the number of cases and the percentage of total cases given each rating. In addition, the percentage of *strengths* is calculated for each *item*. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *areas needing improvement*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the *percentage of strengths*.

SECTION I: REVIEW FINDINGS

Safety Outcome 1: Children Are, First and Foremost, Protected from Abuse and Neglect

Two *items* are included under Safety Outcome 1. Ratings for the two *items* are shown in Table 2.

Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether responses to all accepted child maltreatment reports received during the period under review were initiated and face-to-face contact with the child made, within the timeframes established by agency policies or State statute.

Table 2.

Rating	Item 1	Item 2
<i>Strength</i>	20% (6)	20% (6)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	0% (0)	0% (0)
<i>Not Applicable</i>	80% (24)	80% (24)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	100% (6)	100% (6)

Item 2: Repeat maltreatment

Purpose of Assessment: To determine if any child in the family experienced repeat maltreatment within a 6-month period.

Safety Outcome 2: Children are Safely Maintained in Their Homes Whenever Possible and Appropriate

Two *items* are included under Safety Outcome 2. Ratings for the *items* are shown in Table 3.

Item 3: Services to family

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to provide services to the family to prevent children's entry into foster care or re-entry after a reunification.

Table 3.

Rating	Item 3	Item 4
<i>Strength</i>	33% (10)	50% (15)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	47% (14)	50% (15)
<i>Not Applicable</i>	20% (6)	0% (0)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	41.7% (10)	50% (15)

Item 4: Risk assessment and safety management

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess and address the risk and safety concerns relating to the child(ren) in their own homes or while in foster care.

Permanency Outcome 1: Children Have Permanency and Stability in Their Living Situations

Six *items* are included under Permanency Outcome 1. Ratings for the *items* are shown in Table 4.

Item 5: Foster Care reentries

Purpose of Assessment: To assess whether children who entered foster care during the period under review were re-entering within 12 months of a prior foster care episode.

Item 6: Stability of foster care placement

Purpose of Assessment: To determine if the child in foster care is in a stable placement at the time of the onsite review and that any changes in placement that occurred during the period under review were in the best interest of the child and consistent with achieving the child's permanency goal(s).

Item 7: Permanency goal for child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether appropriate permanency goals were established for the child in a timely manner.

Item 8: Reunification, guardianship or permanent placement with relatives

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether concerted efforts were made, or are being made, during the period under review, to achieve reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives in a timely manner.

Item 9: Adoption

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made, or are being made, to achieve a finalized adoption in a timely manner.

Item 10: Other planned permanent living arrangement (APPLA)

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure:

- That the child is adequately prepared to make the transition from foster care to independent living (if it is expected that the child will remain in foster care until he or she reaches the age of majority or is emancipated).
- That the child, even though remaining in foster care, is in a “permanent” living arrangement with a foster parent or relative caregiver and that there is a commitment on the part of all parties involved that the child remain in that placement until he or she reaches the age of majority or is emancipated.
- That the child is in a long-term care facility and will remain in that facility until transition to an adult care facility.

Table 4.

Rating	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9	Item 10
<i>Strength</i>	20% (6)	43% (13)	37% (11)	27% (8)	10% (3)	3% (1)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	0% (0)	7% (2)	13% (4)	10% (3)	3% (1)	3% (1)
Not Applicable	80% (24)	50% (15)	50% (15)	63% (19)	87% (26)	94% (28)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	100% (6)	86.7% (13)	73.3% (11)	72.7% (8)	75% (3)	50% (1)

Permanency Outcome 2: The Continuity of Family Relationships and Connections is Preserved for Children

Six *items* are included under Permanency Outcome 2. Ratings for the *items* are shown in Table 5.

Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that the child’s foster care placement was close enough to the parent(s) to facilitate face-to-face contact between the child and the parent(s) while the child was in foster care.

Item 12: Placement with siblings

Purpose of Assessment: To determine if, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that siblings in foster care are placed together unless a separation was necessary to meet the needs of one of the siblings.

Item 13: Visiting with parents & siblings in foster care

Purpose of Assessment: To determine if, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that visitation between a child in foster care and his or her mother, father, and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child's relationship with these close family members.

Item 14: Preserving connections

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to maintain the child's connections to his or her neighborhood, community, faith, extended family, tribe, school, and friends.

Item 15: Relative placement

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to place the child with relatives when appropriate.

Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in foster care and his or her mother and father or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

Table 5.

Rating	Item 11	Item 12	Item 13	Item 14	Item 15	Item 16
<i>Strength</i>	33% (10)	27% (8)	23% (7)	47% (14)	37% (11)	20% (6)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	0% (0)	0% (0)	17% (5)	0% (0)	7% (2)	23% (7)
Not Applicable	67% (20)	73% (22)	60% (18)	53% (16)	56% (17)	57% (17)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	100% (10)	100% (8)	58.3% (7)	100% (14)	84.6% (11)	46.2%(6)

Well-Being Outcome 1: Families Have Enhanced Capacity to Provide for Their Children's Needs

Four *items* are included under Well-Being Outcome 1. Ratings for the *items* are shown in Table 6.

Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, & foster parents

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess the needs of children, parents, and foster parents (both at the child's entry into foster care [if the child entered during the period under review] or on an ongoing basis) to identify the services necessary to achieve case goals and adequately address the issues relevant to the agency's involvement with the family, and provided the appropriate services.

Item 18: Child & family involvement in case planning

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made (or are being made) to involve parents and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

Item 19: Caseworker visits with the child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the child(ren) in the case are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child and promote achievement of case goals.

Item 20: Caseworker visits with parents

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the mothers and fathers of the children are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the children and promote achievement of case goals.

Table 6.

Rating	Item 17	Item 18	Item 19	Item 20
<i>Strength</i>	30% (9)	40% (12)	77% (23)	27% (8)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	70% (21)	57% (17)	23% (7)	63% (19)
Not Applicable	0% (0)	3% (1)	0% (0)	10% (3)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	30% (9)	41.4% (12)	76.7% (23)	29.6% (8)

Well-Being Outcome 2: Children Receive Appropriate Services to Meet Their Educational Needs

One *item* is included under Well-Being Outcome 2. Ratings for the *item* are shown in Table 7.

Item 21: Educational needs of child

Purpose of Assessment: To assess whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess children's educational needs at the initial contact with the child (if the case was opened during the period under review) or on an ongoing basis (if the case was opened before the period under review), and whether identified needs were appropriately addressed in case planning and case management activities.

Table 7.

Rating	Item 21
<i>Strength</i>	47% (14)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	10% (3)
Not Applicable	43% (13)
Total	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	82.4% (14)

Well-Being Outcome 3: Children Receive Adequate Services to Meet Their Physical and Mental Health Needs

Two *items* are included under Well-Being Outcome 3. Ratings for the *items* are shown in Table 8.

Item 22: Physical health of child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the physical health needs of the child, including dental health needs.

Item 23: Mental/behavioral health of child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the child(ren).

Table 8.

Rating	Item 22	Item 23
<i>Strength</i>	37% (11)	53% (16)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	33% (10)	13% (4)
Not Applicable	30% (9)	34% (10)
Total	100% (30)	100% (30)
<i>% Strengths</i>	52.4% (11)	80% (16)

Table 9. York County *Percent of Strengths* on 23 Quality Assurance Items Across Two Reviews

Item	September 2013 (PUR 9-1-2012 to 8-31-2013)	March 2014 (PUR 9-1-2013 to 2-28-2014)
1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations	63.2%	100.0%
2. Reoccurrence of Maltreatment	73.3%	100.0%
3. Services to Family	21.7%	41.7%
4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	43.3%	50.0%
5. Foster Care Re-Entries	100.0%	100.0%
6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	60.0%	86.7%
7. Permanency Goal for Child	80.0%	73.3%
8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Perm. Placement with Relatives	50.0%	72.7%
9. Adoption	54.5%	75.0%
10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	50.0%	50.0%
11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	100.0%	100.0%
12. Placement with Siblings	71.4%	100.0%
13. Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	50.0%	58.3%
14. Preserving Connections	93.3%	100.0%
15. Relative Placement	85.7%	84.6%
16. Relationship of Child in Care with Parent	18.2%	46.2%
17. Needs and Services for Child, Parents, and Caregivers	26.7%	30.0%
18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	40.0%	41.4%
19. Worker Visits with Child	73.3%	76.7%
20. Worker Visits with Parents	7.4%	29.6%
21. Educational Needs of the Child	92.9%	82.4%
22. Physical Health of the Child	60.0%	52.4%
23. Mental Health of the Child	62.5%	80.0%

SECTION II: FOSTER CARE LICENSE REVIEW

As part of the Quality Assurance Review Process in York County, ten Foster Home Licenses were randomly selected from the list of all licenses issued for the county during the period under review. These licenses were reviewed using the *South Carolina Department of Social Services Quality Assurance Foster License Review Instrument*. This instrument consists of three sections. The first section focuses on the issuance of the Initial/Standard License. The second section focuses on the standard license renewal process. The final section focuses on deficiencies, namely agency oversight, data entry, and qualitative issues. Deficiencies noted in this section may not invalidate the license but still require attention and correction by county management. Each section of the instrument includes the appropriate agency, state, and federal requirements.

The criteria for Foster Care License review findings include the following *items*:

- information related to firearms and ammunition in the house
- pet vaccination information
- background checks
- convictions
- required trainings
- annual firearms location update
- fire inspections/re-inspections
- a review of any conflicts noted between file documents and CAPSS
- convictions
- training hours
- medical reports
- safety checks of alternative caregivers
- a review of child protective service allegations
- pet vaccination information
- a review of any regulatory infractions
- a review of any conflicts noted between file documents and CAPSS

The following criteria define the possible *deficiencies* found in Initial and Renewal cases:

- a review of the initial background checks
- updated home studies
- discipline agreements
- fire inspections
- fire drills
- quarterly home visits
- disaster preparedness plans
- annual firearms location update
- information concerning the alternative caregivers
- discipline agreements
- disaster preparedness plans
- alternative caregiver forms
- applications
- autobiography information
- financial information
- child factor's checklists
- initial home assessment studies
- references

Areas noted as having occurred as required on the assessment are rated as *strengths*. Those *items* that were not met are rated as an *area needing improvement (ANI)*. If the issue is not applicable, it is rated N/A.

Additionally, the percentage of *strengths* is also calculated for each *item*. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Results of the review are noted in Table 10.

Foster Care Home Licensing Findings for York County

Initial License Cases. Four foster care issuances for initial/standard licenses were reviewed. One case reviewed was rated as *area needing improvement* because all of the licensing requirements were not met prior to authorization of the license renewal. Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* for the one case include:

Firearms:

- Records did not include verification that ammunition was stored separately from firearms.

Renewal License Cases. Five of six cases reviewed were rated as *area needing improvement* because all of the licensing requirements were not met prior to authorization of the license renewal. Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* for the five cases include:

Table 10. Summary of Ratings for Sections One and Two

Rating	Section One: Initial	Section Two: Renewal
<i>Strength</i>	3 (75%)	1 (17%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	1 (25%)	5 (83%)
Total	4 (100%)	6 (100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	3 (75%)	1 (17%)

Medical Record:

- Medical statements for applicable individuals were not located in the case file.

Firearms:

- Records did not include verification that ammunition was stored separately from firearms.

Pet Vaccination Records:

- Up-to-date pet vaccinations for the re-licensure period were not completed or not located in the licensing record.

Background Checks:

- Central registry, SLED, sex offender registry checks, and/or FBI checks were not completed, or were not documented in the case file.

Deficiencies found in Initial and Renewal Cases. Deficiencies were noted for eight of the ten files reviewed. Issues identified by the reviewers include:

Initial Case Deficiencies

Documentation:

- The number of references listed in the case file was insufficient.
- There was a discrepancy between information in CAPSS and the license pertaining to the age of children allowed in the home.

Renewal Case Deficiencies

Fire Drills:

- Records did not include verification that fire drills were conducted regularly.
- Records did not include verification that fire drills were conducted within 24 hours of a child's placement.

Safety:

- Annual Discipline Agreements were not located in the case file, were not dated, or were not signed.
- Quarterly home visits were not completed on a timely, quarterly basis.
- Annual Disaster Plans were not located in the case file.

SECTION III: CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICE SCREEN-OUT REVIEW

A review of ten screened-out allegations was completed to determine whether the reports were screened out according to agency policy and procedure. The reports were randomly selected from the list of reports screened out by the county during the period under review. The *South Carolina Department of Social Services Quality Assurance Review Screen-Out Report Instrument* was used to conduct the review. This instrument includes a description of the allegation and seven questions regarding the screened-out decisions and processes (see Table 11).

Table 11. Summary of Item Ratings for Screen-Out Review

	Yes	No	NA	Total
1. Illegal substance use alleged AND reason for safety threatened with harm	1	9	0	10
2. Use of CAPSS and/or other systems for prior involvement	10	0	0	10
3a. Maltreatment tab in CAPSS completed	4	6	0	10
3b. If "No" is selected, was there an explanation	0	9	1	10
4. Contact with necessary collaterals prior to screen-out decision	3	4	3	10
5. Another intake referral on same perpetrator and/or child within 12 months	1	9	0	10
6. Intake Supervisor ensured consultation with another supervisory-level authority	0	1	9	10

*Note: A single case may have more than one issue identified.

The percentage of *strengths* is also calculated for the cases reviewed. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Findings of these reviews are noted in Table 12.

Table 12. Summary of Ratings for Screen-Outs Review

Rating	Was this case screened-out according to agency policy?
<i>Strength</i>	4 (40%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	6 (60%)
Total	10 (100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	4 (40%)

Six of ten cases were determined to be screened-out in violation of agency policy and procedures. Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* include:

- The information obtained was insufficient to complete the Intake Risk Assessment Reference Table.
- The Intake Risk Assessment Reference Table was inconsistent regarding the frequency of incidents.
- The agency failed to obtain a drug screen demonstrating negative results for a mother.
- The Maltreatment tab in CAPSS was not thoroughly completed. No explanation was provided.

SECTION IV: FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES REVIEW

A review of five allegations was completed to determine whether the report was referred to Family Support Services according to agency policy and procedure. The report was randomly selected from the list of reports referred to a Community-Based Prevention Services Provider by the county during the period under review. The *South Carolina Department of Social Services Quality Assurance Review Community-Based Prevention Services Assessment Instrument* was used to conduct the review. This instrument includes a description of the allegation and twelve questions regarding the referral to the Family Strengthening Services (FSS) Community-Based Prevention Services Provider and processes (see Table 13).

Table 13. Summary of Item Ratings for Assessment

	Yes	No	NA	Total
1. Illegal substance use alleged AND reason for safety threatened with harm	0	5	0	5
2. Use of CAPSS and/or other systems for prior involvement	5	0	0	5
3a. Maltreatment tab in CAPSS completed	5	0	0	5
3b. Explanation for "no" in maltreatment tab	0	4	1	5
4. Existing Safety Factors not seen by intake worker or documented	0	5	0	5
5. Assessment made utilizing SCDSS Risk Matrix	5	0	0	5
6a. Results of SCDSS Risk Matrix contradicted allegation made by reporter	1	4	0	5
6b. Did results fail to include statements to support allegations made by reporter	0	5	0	5
7. Agency contacted collaterals for Community-Based Prevention Services	0	2	3	5
8. Additional intake referral made on same perpetrator AND/OR child	3	2	0	5
9. Family received community-based prevention services	2	1	2	5
9a. Community-based provider entered an account in CAPSS	5	0	0	5

*Note: A single case may have more than one issue identified.

The percentage of *strengths* is also calculated for the cases reviewed. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Findings of these reviews are noted in Table 14.

Table 14. Summary of Ratings for FSS Review

Rating	Was this case referred according to agency policy?
<i>Strength</i>	2 (40%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	3 (60%)
Total	5 (100%)
% <i>Strengths</i>	2 (40%)

Three cases reviewed were determined to be inappropriately referred according to agency policy and procedures. Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* include:

- There was no documentation indicating that the agency made or attempted to make all appropriate collateral contacts.
- The assigned risk rating does not reflect information regarding chronicity of abuse supported by information in CAPSS.
- The results of a Risk Matrix supported a referral to Voluntary Case Management (VCM) rather than FSS.

SECTION V: VOLUNTARY CASE MANAGEMENT REVIEW

A review of three allegations was completed to determine whether the report was referred to Voluntary Case Management according to agency policy and procedure. The report was selected from the list of reports referred to a Community-Based Prevention Services Provider by the county during the period under review. The *South Carolina Department of Social Services Quality Assurance Review Community-Based Prevention Services Assessment Instrument* was used to conduct the review. This instrument includes a description of the allegation and twelve questions regarding the referral to the Voluntary Case Management (VCM) Community-Based Prevention Services Provider and processes (see Table 15).

Table 15. Summary of Item Ratings for Assessment

	Yes	No	NA	Total
1. Illegal substance use alleged AND reason for safety threatened with harm	0	3	0	3
2. Use of CAPSS and/or other systems for prior involvement	2	1	0	3
3a. Maltreatment tab in CAPSS completed	3	0	0	3
3b. Explanation for "no" in maltreatment tab	0	3	0	3
4. Existing Safety Factors not seen by intake worker or documented	0	3	0	3
5. Assessment made utilizing SCDSS Risk Matrix	3	0	0	3
6a. Results of SCDSS Risk Matrix contradicted allegation made by reporter	1	2	0	3
6b. Did results fail to include statements to support allegations made by reporter	0	3	0	3
7. Agency contacted collaterals for Community-Based Prevention Services	1	0	2	3
8. Additional intake referral made on same perpetrator AND/OR child	1	2	0	3
9. Family received community-based prevention services	0	1	2	3
9a. Community-based provider entered an account in CAPSS	3	0	0	3

*Note: A single case may have more than one issue identified.

The percentage of *strengths* is also calculated for the cases reviewed. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Findings of these reviews are noted in Table 16.

Table 16. Summary of Ratings for VCM Review

Rating	Was this case referred according to agency policy?
<i>Strength</i>	1 (33%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	2 (67%)
Total	3 (100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	1 (33.3%)

Two cases reviewed were determined to be inappropriately referred according to agency policy and procedures. Issues identified that led to the rating of *ANI* include:

- There was no verification that the agency researched CAPSS prior to referring to VCM services because the Records Check tab referred to dictation, but no dictation was available.
- Information in CAPSS and the Risk Matrix indicated a higher baseline risk rating than that which was selected.

SECTION VI: CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES UNFOUNDED REPORTS REVIEW

Five unfounded reports were reviewed to determine whether the reports were unfounded in accordance with agency policy and procedure. The five unfounded reports were randomly selected from the list of all reports unfounded by the county during the period under review. The review was conducted using the *South Carolina Department of Social Services Quality Assurance Review Unfounded Report Instrument*. This instrument includes a description of the allegation and items regarding three primary areas (see Table 17):

- Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment,
- Repeat maltreatment, and
- Risk assessment and safety management.

Table 17. Summary of Item Ratings for Unfounded Review

	Yes	No	N/A	Total
1A. Investigation not initiated in accordance with timeframes and requirements	0	5	0	5
1B. Face-to-face contact not made in accordance with timeframes and requirements	3	2	0	5
1C. Delays in investigation initiation or face-to-face contact beyond control of agency	0	3	2	5
2A. At least one substantiated or indicated maltreatment report	0	5	0	5
2B. One substantiated or indicated maltreatment report within six months before or after	0	0	5	5
2C. Repeat maltreatment involving the same or similar circumstances	0	0	5	5
3A. Initial assessment of risk to the children and family in the home	5	0	0	5
3B. Initial assessment in accordance with established timeframe	2	3	0	5
3C. Ongoing assessment(s) of risk to the children and family in the home	2	3	0	5
3D. Safety concerns that were not adequately or appropriately addressed by the agency	2	3	0	5

*Note: A single case may have more than one issue identified.

The percentage of *strengths* is calculated for each decision to unfound. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Findings of these reviews are noted in Table 18.

Table 18. Summary of Ratings for Unfounded Review

Rating	Were cases unfounded according to agency policy?
<i>Strength</i>	1 (20%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	4 (80%)
Total	5 (100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	1 (20%)

Reasons that four unfounded cases reviewed violated agency policy and procedure include:

- Appropriate referrals for service and/or provision of services did not occur.
 - Indicated services included: BabyNet, drug screening, counseling, anger management, and medical follow-up on a forensic interview.
- The agency failed to conduct ongoing assessments of fathers, mothers, and children.
- The agency failed to appropriately discuss and address the allegation with a mother and father.
- The agency failed to make all appropriate collateral contacts.

APPENDIX 1. SUMMARY OF ISSUES CAUSING AREA OF NEEDED IMPROVEMENT (ANI) RATINGS FOR APPLICABLE CASES

The following is an overview of strengths and weaknesses that were found in the cases for York County during the review conducted March 10-14, 2014. The period under review was September 1, 2013 to February 28, 2014.

Positives:

Items 1 (Timeliness of initiating investigations), 2 (Repeat maltreatment), 5 (Foster Care reentries), 11 (Proximity of Foster Care placement), 12 (Placement with siblings) and 14 (Preserving connections) were identified as *strengths* of the agency; all of the cases reviewed were rated as *strength* with no *area needing improvement (ANI)*.

Concerns:

The following examines the *outcomes* and *items* that had the highest negative ratings.

Safety 2 (Children are Safely Maintained in their Homes whenever Possible and Appropriate)

- 3% of the cases were rated *Partially Achieved*
- 47% of the cases were rated *Not Achieved*

Items found to be a weakness within this outcome include:

- *Item 3 (Services to family)* - 14 of 24 (58.3%) applicable cases rated as *ANI*
 - The agency failed to conduct assessments on children remaining in the care of their parents.
 - Safety services were not provided to prevent entry into foster care.
 - The agency failed to provide services for all involved individuals.
 - Indicated services included: drug screens, anger management, and Criminal Domestic Violence (CDV) counseling.
- *Item 4 (Risk assessment and safety management)* - 15 of 30 (50%) applicable cases rated as *ANI*
 - The agency failed to make contact with and assess all involved individuals.
 - Assessments that were not done included: CDV, mental health, and sexual predator.
 - Safety concerns were not adequately managed.
 - A thorough assessment of a living environment was not conducted.
 - Safety plans were either not continually monitored or were violated.

- There was no follow-up on concerns such as drug use allegations and unmanaged anger issues.
- The agency failed to make a concerted effort to ensure that parents were compliant with services.

Permanency Outcome 2 (The Continuity of Family Relationships and Connections is Preserved for Children)

- 27% of the cases were rated *Partially Achieved*

Items found to be a weakness within this outcome include:

- *Item 16 (Relationship of child in care with parents) – 7 of 13 (53.8%)*
 - The agency failed to make concerted efforts to promote, support, and maintain positive relationships between the child and the parent beyond just visitation, such as by attending dental appointments and school performances. People specifically affected include:
 - Mothers
 - Fathers
 - Mother's paramour

Well-Being 1 (Families have Enhanced Capacity to Provide for their Children's Needs)

- 60% of the cases were rated *Partially Achieved*
- 13% of the cases were rated being *Not Achieved*

Items found to be a weakness within this outcome include:

- *Item 17 (Needs and services of child, parents, & foster parents) – 21 of 30 (70%) applicable cases rated as ANI*
 - The agency failed to conduct ongoing assessments of needs of fathers, foster parents, a mother, and a paramour.
 - Incarcerated fathers were not assessed, and no barriers were documented.
 - The agency failed to conduct mental health assessments and CDV assessments to identify and address the needs of parents.
 - Foster parents were not assessed prior to placing a child in the home.
 - The agency failed to provide all appropriate services.
 - Mental health, substance abuse, and CDV services.

- Identified barriers were not addressed, such as financial assistance for drug treatments.
 - Concerted efforts were not made to involve parents in their treatment plan.
 - Diligent searches were not made to find fathers.
- *Item 18 (Child & family involvement in case planning)* – 17 of 29 (58.6%) applicable cases rated as *ANI*
 - The agency failed to involve mothers, fathers, and a paramour in case planning.
 - The agency failed to make contact with incarcerated fathers.
 - The agency failed to engage fathers when their location was known.
 - The agency did not send the recommended treatment plan for a sexual predator assessment to one father’s attorney.
 - The agency failed to involve developmentally and age appropriate children in case planning.
- *Item 20 (Caseworker visits with parents)* – 19 of 27 (70.4%) applicable cases rated as *ANI*
 - The frequency of visitation with fathers and a paramour was insufficient.
 - The agency failed to attempt visitation with incarcerated fathers.
 - The agency failed to maintain regular contact with fathers living out-of-state.
 - Diligent searches were not conducted to assist in contacting fathers; the only barrier listed was unsuccessful prior attempts at contact.
 - The quality of visitation was insufficient.
 - The agency failed to conduct strengths assessments or address barriers to compliance, such as parents rejecting treatment plans.

Well-Being 3 (Children receive Adequate Services to meet their Physical and Mental Health Needs)

- 27% being only *Partially Achieved*
- 19% of total cases being *Not Achieved*

Items found to be a weakness within this outcome include:

- *Item 22 (Physical health of child)* – 10 of 21 (47.6%) applicable cases rated as *ANI*
 - Dental health needs were not met.
 - The agency failed to provide appropriate services to address dental health needs.

- Dental health assessments and records were not in the case file.
- Physical health needs were not met.
 - Physical health assessments were not in the case file.
 - An injury a child suffered was not assessed or addressed, despite it being the reason for agency involvement.
- The agency failed to make contact with the service provider.