

# **Horry County DSS Child Welfare Services Review December 2006**

During the week of November 27 - December 1, 2006, a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Horry County. A sample of open and closed foster care and treatment cases were reviewed. Also reviewed were screened-out intakes, foster home licensing records, and unfounded investigations. Stakeholders interviewed for this review included foster parents, Horry DSS supervisors, representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

**Period included in Case Record Review: May 1, 2006 to October 31, 2006**

**Period included in Outcome Measures: September 1, 2005 to October 31, 2006**

## **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.

**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

**Ratings**

The standard that must be met for all items reviewed onsite is 90%. Each outcome report has its own standard. To be rated Strength most items must meet both the qualitative onsite review standard **and** the quantitative outcome report standard.

**Section One**

**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 | <b>Strength</b>                 |
| 2) Repeat Maltreatment                     | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Safety Item 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	100	0	0	7	0
Treatment	7	100	0	0	3	0
Total Cases	10	100	0	0	10	0

**Explanation of Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations**

This is an area of **Strength** for Horry DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all (100%) accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. Reviewers found that the agency consistently initiated its investigations within required time frames. Reviewers found some data entry errors that made it appear that investigations were initiated prior to the intake time.

**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

<b>Onsite Review Findings</b>						
<b>Safety Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	70	3	30	0	0
Treatment	9	90	1	10	0	0
Total Cases	16	80	4	20	0	0

**Explanation of Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item measures the occurrence of maltreatment among children under agency supervision, or within a year of having their case closed by the agency. Onsite reviewers found that 20% of the children experienced additional maltreatment. The children experiencing additional or ongoing maltreatment were in foster care placements that were not capable of managing the children's behavior.

---

**Section Two**

<b>Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.</b>
---

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

- 3) Services to family to protect children and prevent removal     **Area Needing Improvement**
- 4) Risk of Harm     **Area Needing Improvement**

<b>Onsite Review Findings</b>						
<b>Safety Item 3: Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in Home and Prevent Removal</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	40	3	60	5	0
Treatment	6	67	3	33	1	0
Total Cases	8	57	6	43	6	0

**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item assesses whether services were adequate to protect children in their home and prevent their removal and placement into foster care. In 33% of the treatment cases reviewed, the families were not receiving the kinds of services needed to ensure the safety of the children who remained with their parents or relatives. Reviewers found cases with no treatment plans and instances of parents being presented a treatment plan just prior to going to court.

**Onsite Review Findings**

**Safety Item 4: Risk of Harm**

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	0
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0	0
Total Cases	16	80	4	20	0	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item assesses whether the agency's interventions reduced risk of harm to children. Thirty percent of the treatment cases needed improvement because the agency's interventions were not reducing the risk of harm to the children in those families. Reviewers consistently found fathers or alternative caregivers' needs not being assessed. In one treatment case, there was no documentation to indicate if contact was made with other children residing in the home. In several cases, reviewers were not able to locate a treatment plan to identify the needs and services for the victim child or the child's parents or caregivers.

**Stakeholder Comment:** The treatment plans are the same in every case, there is not enough individual attention to treatment needs. DSS indicates that there is a lack of resources. Every parent has the same plan: go to drug/alcohol evaluation, go to parenting class, maintain a stable home. Services need to be individualized. Sometimes DSS needs to require more from the parents.

**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

**Section Three**

**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   | <b>Strength</b>                 |
| 6) Stability of foster care placement   | <b>Strength</b>                 |
| 7) Permanency goal for child  | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| 8) Reunification or permanent placement with relatives                        | <b>Strength</b>                 |
| 9) Adoption   | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| 10) Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA) | <b>Strength</b>                 |

**Agency Data**

Measure P1.1: **Foster Care Re-entries** – Of all children who entered care during the year under review, the percent that re-entered foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode.

	Number Children Entering Care 11/01/05 to 10/31/06	Number That Were Returned Home Within The Past 12 Months From Previous Fos Care Episode	Number of Children Objective >= 91.40%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,427	281	3,732	13.7
Horry	219	5	200	13.8

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Horry DSS. This item measures the frequency of children re-entering foster care within a year of discharge. Both the outcome report and onsite review findings indicate that children re-entering foster care within a year of discharge is a relatively rare occurrence in Horry County. Though Horry is a resource poor county the DSS staff directly provide a considerable amount of support to the families they serve.

**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

<b>Agency Data</b>				
Measure P1.2: <b>Stability of Foster Care Placement</b> – Of all children who have been in foster care less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home, the percent that had not more than 2 placement settings.				
	Number of Children In Care Less Than 12 Months	Number of Children With No More Than 2 Placements	Number of Children Objective >= 86.70%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,936	3,185	3,412	(227.5)
Horry	269	244	233	10.8

Note: This is a federally established objective.

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Horry DSS. This item measures the frequency of placement changes for children in foster care, and assesses the reasons for those changes. The county met the federal standard for stability. In all of the foster care cases reviewed, children in Horry County were stable in their placements and did not have multiple moves.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Permanency Item 7: Permanency Goal for Children</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	70	3	30	0	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness of permanency goals for children in foster care and the timeliness of those permanency decisions. This was an area needing improvement because, in 30% of the cases, reviewers found that the agency took well over a year to change permanency plans from Return Home to TPR/Adoption when there was ample evidence of non-compliance and poor prognosis for improvement of the parent's risky behavior.

**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

<b>Agency Data</b>				
Measure P1.3: <b>Length of Time to Achieve Reunification</b> – Of all children who were reunified with their parents or caregiver, at the time of discharge from foster care, the percent reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home.				
	Number of Children Where Fos Care Services Closed. Last Plan Was Return Home 11/01/05– 10/31/06	Number of Children In Care Less Than 12 Months	Number Of Children Objective $\geq 76.20\%$ *	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	2,148	1,747	1636.7	110.2
Horry	129	124	98.3	25.7

\*This is a federally established objective.

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the activities and processes necessary to accomplish the goal of reunification with caregivers or placement with relatives. Agency data shows that 96% (124/129) of the children who entered care during the period under review returned home within a year of entering care. This exceeded the 76.2% standard by a significant margin.

<b>Agency Data</b>				
Measure P1.4: <b>Length of Time to Achieve Adoption</b> – Of all children who exited from foster care during the year under review to a finalized adoption, the percent that exited care in less than 24 months from the time of the latest removal from home.				
	Number of Children With Finalized Adoption Within Past 12 Months	Number of Children Where Adoption Was Finalized Within 24 Months of Entering Care	Number of Children Objective $\geq 32.00\%$ *	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	413	67	132.1	(65.2)
Horry	21	3	6.7	(3.7)

Note: This is a federally established objective.

**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Permanency Item 9: Adoption</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	25	3	75	6	0

**Explanation of Item 9: Adoption**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the process within the child welfare system to achieve timely adoptions for children in foster care. Agency data shows that 14% (3/21) of the adoptions were completed within 24 months of the children entering care. Reviewers found that delays in filing petitions, continued hearings, and a practice of waiting too long before changing the plan from Return Home to TPR/Adoption contributed to delays in permanency for children with the plan of Adoption.

**Stakeholder Comment:** Adoptions are not occurring timely because TPR's are not getting done, and other kids who have been through TPR are lagging in being adopted. These changes are associated with changes/instability with attorneys.

<b>Agency Data</b>				
Measure P1.6: <b>Permanency Goal of "Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement"</b> – Of all children in foster care, the percent with a permanency goal of emancipation (Indep Liv Services) or a planned permanent living arrangement other than adoption, guardianship, or return to family.				
	Number of Children In Care at Least One Day 11/01/05 – 10/31/06	Number of Children In Care With Permanent Plan "Other Planned Living Arrangement"	Number of Children Objective $\geq 85.00\%$ *	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	8,453	1,476	7,185	208.1
Horry	357	32	303.4	21.6

\* This is a DSS established objective.

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

This is area of **Strength** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the appropriateness and effectiveness of services provided to children with the permanency plan of APPLA. Agency data shows that only 9% (32/357) of the children in care had the plan of APPLA. Reviewers found that children with this plan were receiving appropriate independent living services.



**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

**Section Four**

**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                | <b>Strength</b>                 |
| 12) Placement with siblings in foster care            | <b>Strength</b>                 |
| 13) Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| 14) Preserving connections                            | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| 15) Relative placement                                | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| 16) Relationship of child in care with parents        | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |

**Agency Data**

Measure P2.1: **Proximity to Home of Foster Care Placement** – Of all children in foster care during the reporting period (excluding MTS and Adoptions children), the percent placed within their county of origin.

	Number of Children In Care 11/01/05 – 10/31/06	Number of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Percent of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Number of Children Objective >= 70.00%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	6,329	3,889	61.5	4,430.3	(541.3)
Horry	354	272	76.8	269.5	24.2

\*This is a DSS established objective.

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Horry County DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep children close enough to their families so that essential relationships can be maintained. One measure used to evaluate this item is the percentage of children who are placed within the county. The objective is at least 70% of the children in care be placed within the county. Agency data shows that 77% of the children were placed within the county.

**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Permanency Item 12: Placement with Siblings</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	100	0	0	5	0

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

This is an area of **Strength** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to keep siblings together when it is appropriate to do so. Onsite reviewers found that siblings who were not placed together were separated for appropriate reasons, not simply because there was no placement willing to take all of them. Horry County does a very good job of keeping sibling groups together.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Permanency Item 13: Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	57	3	43	3	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to ensure that visits occur between children in foster care and their siblings and parents. Reviewers rated 43% of the cases as needing improvement because there were unexplained periods during which visits with the siblings or parents (especially fathers) did not occur.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Permanency Item 14: Preserving connections</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	67	2	33	4	0

**Explanation of Item 14: Preserving Connections**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to preserve children's connections to the people, places and things that are important to them. In 33% of the cases, the agency made no effort to maintain contacts with the people who were important to children in foster care.

**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Permanency Item 15: Relative Placement</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	55	4	45	1	0

**Explanation of Item 15: Relative Placement**

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to identify and assess relatives as potential placement resources for children in foster care. Reviewers found that the agency failed to assess paternal relatives in 45% of the cases.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Permanency Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care with Parents</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	57	3	43	3	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to promote a supportive relationship between children in care and their parents, beyond the twice minimum visitation requirement. Forty-three percent of the cases needed improvement because the agency did not involve known fathers, or rule them out by some assessment.

**Section Five**

**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 | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| 18) Child and family involvement in case planning       | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| 19) Worker visits with child                            | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |
| 20) Worker visits with parents                          | <b>Area Needing Improvement</b> |

**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

<b><u>Site Visit Findings</u></b>						
<b>Well Being Item 17: Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	50	5	50	0	0
Treatment	4	40	6	60	0	0
Total Cases	9	45	11	55	0	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item asks two questions: 1) Were the needs of the child, parents, and caregivers assessed, and 2) Did the agency take steps to meet the identified needs? Reviewers rated 50% of Foster Care cases and 60% of treatment cases as needed improvement for this item. In those cases non-custodial parents and alternate caregivers were either ignored, or offered no services.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Well Being Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	43	4	57	3	0
Treatment	6	60	4	40	0	0
Total Cases	9	53	8	47	3	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's efforts to involve parents and children in the case planning process. Reviewers found that 57% of foster care and 40% of treatment cases needed improvement in this area for several reasons: a) some cases had no treatment plan, b) some cases failed to acknowledge fathers in the treatment plans, and c) some cases failed to share the agency prepared treatment plans with parents until just before a court hearing.

**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Well Being Item 19: Worker Visits with Child</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	4	40	6	60	0	0
Total Cases	14	70	6	30	0	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with children under agency supervision, and evaluates the quality of those visits. State law and agency policy requires that children under agency supervision be seen each month. This was an area of strength for all foster care cases. However, reviewers rated 60% of treatment cases as needing improvement because children were not seen each month and, during some of those visits, workers did not attend to relevant issues.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Well Being Item 20: Worker Visits with Parent(s)</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	0	0	5	100	5	0
Treatment	4	40	6	60	0	0
Total Cases	4	27	11	73	5	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item measures the frequency of caseworker visits with parents, and evaluates the quality of those visits. Every foster care case reviewed and 60% of the treatment cases needed improvement. The agency often ignored both custodial and non-custodial fathers. Its visits were sporadic and did not consistently address relevant issues. It was apparent that some new caseworkers were conducting face-to-face visits with parents without understanding the purpose of those visits.

**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

**Section Six**

**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) Needs and services of child, parents and caregivers **Area Needing Improvement**

**Onsite Review Findings**

**Well Being Item 21: Educational Needs of Child**

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	83	1	17	4	0
Treatment	2	33	4	67	4	0
Total Cases	7	58	5	42	8	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and address the educational needs of children under agency supervision. Although this was a relatively strong area for children in foster care, the overall performance needed improvement because in 42% of the cases the agency either failed to assess the educational needs of children or failed to follow-up once problems were identified.

**Section Seven**

**Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.**

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

22) Physical health of the child **Area Needing Improvement**  
 23) Mental health of the child **Area Needing Improvement**

**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

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

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and attend to the medical needs of children under agency supervision. Reviewers found instances of children with identified medical needs whose needs were not being met because transportation and financial barriers. Reviewers also found instances in which the medical needs of children were not assessed.

<b><u>Onsite Review Findings</u></b>						
<b>Well Being Item 23: Mental Health of the Child</b>						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	80	1	20	5	0
Treatment	3	50	3	50	4	0
Total Cases	7	63	4	37	9	0

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

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. This item evaluates the agency's ability to assess and meet the mental health needs of children under agency supervision. The mental health needs of children in foster care were generally met. That was often the case because those children were in group care or therapeutic facilities in other counties and those facilities attended to the mental health needs of the children. However, the mental health needs of half of the children in treatment cases were not well managed. Children in treatment cases who had experienced traumatic conditions under their parents' care were placed with relatives, often grandparents, without assistance to care for those children's mental health needs.

**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

---

**Section Eight – Foster Home Licenses**

This is an area of **Strength** for Horry DSS. There were no unlicensed foster homes.

- Quarterly home visits were consistently completed timely.
  - The quarterly home visit checklist was used to ensure that all pertinent issues were covered.
  - Licensing information in CAPSS was up-to-date and consistent with the hard copy case record.
  - Inspections and background checks were completed and well documented.
  - Training hours were completed by foster parents and clearly documented.
- 

**Section Nine – Unfounded Investigations**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Was the investigation initiated timely?	5	0
Was the assessment adequate?	3	2
Was the decision appropriate?	3	2

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. The inadequate assessments in two of the 5 cases reviewed resulted in decisions that were not supported by the facts. In each instance the investigation failed to include significant information. In one instance needed background checks and drug screens were not done. In the other, the reported neighbor, who was supposed to watch the children, was not contacted to verify the mother's story.



**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

---

**Section Ten – Screened Out Intakes**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Cannot Determine</b>
Was Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	7	2	1
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?	4	3	3
Were Appropriate Referrals Made?	1	2	7

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Horry DSS. Although the decision to screen out 7 of the 10 intakes reviewed was appropriate, the 30% error rate is too high. The inappropriately screened out intakes contained information that indicated that the children involved might be at risk of abuse or neglect. Without a thorough investigation those risks could not be ruled out.

**Horry County DSS  
Child Welfare Services Review  
December 2006**

<b>Horry County DSS Combined Foster Care &amp; Treatment Tally</b>			
<b>Performance Item or Outcome</b>	<b>Performance Item Ratings</b>		
	<b>Strength</b>	<b>Area Needing Improvement</b>	<b>N/A*</b>
<b>Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.</b>			
Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	10/10= 100%	0	10
Item 2: Repeat maltreatment	16/20= 80%	4/20 = 20%	0
<b>Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.</b>			
Item 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	8/14=57%	6/14=43%	6
Item 4: Risk of harm to child(ren)	16/20 = 80%	4/20 = 20%	0
<b>Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.</b>			
Item 5: Foster care re-entries	4/5=80%	1/5=20%	5
Item 6: Stability of foster care placement	10/10 = 100%	0	0
Item 7: Permanency goal for child	7/10 = 70%	3/10 = 30%	0
Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	3/6 = 50%	3/6 = 50%	4
Item 9: Adoption	1/4=25%	3/4=75%	6
Item 10: Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	0	0	10
<b>Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.</b>			
Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement	8/8=100%	0	2
Item 12: Placement with siblings	5/5=100%	0	5
Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	4/7=57%	3/7=43%	3
Item 14: Preserving connections	4/6 = 67%	2/6=33%	4
Item 15: Relative placement	5/9 = 56%	4/9 = 44%	1
Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents	4/7=57%	3/7= 43%	3
<b>Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.</b>			
Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, caregiver	9/20 = 45%	11/20 = 55%	0
Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning	9/17=53%	8/17 = 47%	3
Item 19: Worker visits with child	14/20 = 70%	6/20 = 30%	0
Item 20: Worker visits with parent(s)	4/15= 27%	11/15= 73%	5
<b>Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.</b>			
Item 21: Educational needs of the child	7/12=58%	5/12=42%	8
<b>Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.</b>			
Item 22: Physical health of the child	12/20 = 60%	8/20 = 40%	0
Item 23: Mental health of the child	7/11= 64%	4/11 = 36%	9