

Hampton County DSS Child Welfare Services Review March 2006

During the week of February 27 – March 3, 2005 a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an on-site review of child welfare services in Hampton County. A sample of 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, a foster child, a client receiving CPS treatment services, the Foster Parents' Association, representatives from the schools, the Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health, DAODAS, Guardian Ad Litem, and Law Enforcement.

Period included in Case Record Review: August 1, 2005 – January 31, 2006

Period included in Outcome Measures: February 1, 2005 – January 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 (sec 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.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Section One

Safety Outcome 1: Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect.

Summary of Findings

Overall Finding: Substantially Achieved

-Safety Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations.

Finding: Strength

-Safety Item 2: Repeat maltreatment.

Finding: Strength

Analysis of Safety Item 1 Findings

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure S1.1: Timeliness of initiating investigations on reports of child maltreatment

Data Time Period: 02/1/05 to 01/31/06

	Number of Reports Accepted	Number of Investigations Initiated Timely	Number of Investigations Objective >= 99.99%*	Number of Investigations Above (Below) Objective
State	16,334	15,698	16,332.37	(634.37)
Hampton	98	97	97.99	(0.99)

* This standard is based on state law. It is not a federally established objective.

Site Visit Findings

Performance Item Ratings

Safety Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	100	0	0	7	
Treatment	0	0	0	0	10	
Total Cases	3	100	0	0	17	

Explanation

This is a “Strength” for Hampton DSS. State law requires that an investigation of all accepted reports of abuse and neglect be initiated within 24 hours. All of the cases reviewed onsite were rated “Strength”. The agency’s monthly outcome report indicates that, for the 12-month period under review, Hampton DSS did not initiate 1 of its 98 (1.02%) investigations of alleged abuse and neglect within 24-hours, as required by state law. No stakeholder expressed concern about Hampton DSS’ response to reports.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Analysis of Safety Item 2 Findings

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure S1.2: Recurrence of Maltreatment – Of all children who were victims of indicated reports of child abuse and/or neglect during the reporting period, the percent having another indicated report within a subsequent 6 month period.

Indicated Reports Between: 08/01/04 to 07/31/05

	Number of Child Victims	Number of Child Victims In Another Founded Report	Number of Children Objective <= 93.90%	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	10,011	98	9,400.33	512.67
Hampton	68	0	63.85	4.15

Note: This is a federally established objective.

Site Visit Findings

Performance Item Ratings

Safety Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	
Treatment	10	100	0	0	0	
Total Cases	20	100	0	0	0	

Explanation

This is a “Strength” for Hampton DSS. According to data in CAPSS, none of the children that were found to be abused or neglected during the period under review was a victim in a previously founded report. This was also true in the 20 cases reviewed during the site visit.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Section Two

Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

Summary of Findings

Overall Finding: Substantially Achieved

-Safety Item 3: Services to prevent removal.

Finding: Strength

-Safety Item 4: Risk of harm to child (ren).

Finding: Strength

Analysis of Safety Item 3 Findings

<u>Site Visit Findings</u>		Performance Item Ratings				
Safety Item 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	2	100	0	0	8	
Treatment	10	100	0	0	0	
Total Cases	12	100	0	0	8	

Explanation

This is a “Strength” for Hampton DSS. This item assesses the appropriateness of the services selected to prevent the removal of children from their family. Reviewers rated all 12 of the applicable cases “strength” for this item. Relatives were often used as emergency caregivers to reduce risk to children and avoid placing them in foster care. A number of the relative placements we reviewed evolved into permanent solutions where relatives were given physical and legal custody and the cases were closed.

In the cases reviewed, when DSS decided to remove children from their home, those decisions were supported by the facts of the cases. In all cases, when DSS decided to leave children in their home after a finding that abuse or neglect had occurred, the services selected to protect those children were appropriate.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Analysis of Safety Item 4 Findings

<u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u>				
Measure S2.2: Risk of harm to child – Of all unfounded investigations during the reporting period, the percent receiving subsequent reports within six months of the initial report.				
	Number Alleged Child Victims in an Unfounded Report 08/1/04 to 07/31/05	Number With Another Report Within 6 Months of Unfounded Determination	Number of Cases Met Objective >= 91.50%*	Number of Cases Above (Below) Objective
State	13,359	1,119	12,223.49	16.51
Hampton	79	11	72.29	(4.29)

* This is a DSS established objective.

The purpose of outcome measure S2.2 is to be an indication, based on data in CAPSS, that the agency is properly assessing risk and making appropriate decisions when unfounding CPS investigations. Subsequent reports can be viewed as an indication that the previous assessments or interventions may not have been adequate. The standard for this measure is that no more than 8.5% of the alleged child victims have another report within 6 months of an unfounded report. From August 1, 2004 to July 31, 2005, 11 of the 79 (13.9%) child victims in reports unfounded by Hampton County were reported again to DSS within 6 months of that unfounded determination.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u>		Performance Item Ratings				
Safety Item 4: Risk of harm.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	
Treatment	10	100	0	0	0	
Total Cases	20	100	0	0	0	

Explanation

This is a “Strength” for Hampton DSS. Even though Hampton’s outcome measure S2.2 did not meet the objective established by DSS, during the on-site visit reviewers found that all 20 (100%) records contained documentation that risk was reduced after agency intervention so that the children were safe in the current placement.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Section Three

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

Summary of Findings

Overall Finding:	Substantially Achieved
-Item 5: Foster care re-entries	Finding: Strength
-Item 6: Stability of foster care placement	Finding: Strength
-Item 7: Permanency goal for child	Finding: Strength
-Item 8: Reunification, placement w/ relatives	Finding: Strength
-Item 9: Adoption	Finding: Strength
-Item 10: Perm goal of other planned arrangement	Finding: Strength

Analysis of Safety Permanency Item 5 Findings

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure P3.1: **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 02/1/05 to 01/31/06	Number That Were Returned Home Within The Past 12 Months From Previous Foster Care Episode	Number of Children Objective $\geq 91.40\%*$	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,255	242	2,975.07	37.93
Hampton	16	0	14.62	1.38

* This is a federally established objective.

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings

Permanency Item 5: Foster care re-entries.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	100	0	0	9	

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Explanation

Foster Care Re-entries is a “Strength” for Hampton DSS. CAPSS shows that none of the children who entered foster care in Hampton County during the period under review had been returned home in the prior 12 months. Hampton DSS met the federal standard for foster care re-entries. None of the cases reviewed onsite involved a child re-entering foster care.

Analysis of Safety Permanency Item 6 Findings

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure P3.2: **Stability of Foster Care Placement** – 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 no more than 2 placement settings.

Children in Care Less than 12 Months at any Time from: 02/1/05 to 01/31/06

	Number of Children In Care Less Than 12 Months	Number of Children With No More Than 2 Placements	Number of Children Objective $\geq 86.70\%$ *	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,736	3,024	3,239.11	(215.11)
Hampton	16	15	13.87	1.13

* This is a federally established objective.

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings

Permanency Item 6: Stability of foster care placement.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	

Explanation

Stability of foster care placement is a “Strength” for Hampton DSS. The outcome report shows that 15 of the 16 children (94%) in care less than 12 months had no more than 2 foster care placements. This is above the standard of 86.7%. In the sample of 10 foster care cases reviewed, one involved a child who had more than two foster care placements within the past 12 months. That one child was moved from DSS foster care to a DJJ evaluation facility and back to DSS due to his aggressive behavior in the foster homes.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Analysis of Safety Permanency Item 7 Findings

Strategic Outcome Report Findings				
Measure P3.5: Permanency Goal for Child – Of all children who have been in foster care for 15 of the most recent 22 months, the percent for which a Termination of Parental Rights (TPR) petition has been filed.				
	Children in Care At Least 15 of Last 22 Months 02/05 – 01/06	Number Children With TPR Complaint	Number of Children Objective $\geq 53.00\%$ *	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,601	1,662	1,908.53	(246.53)
Hampton	8	2	4.24	(2.24)

* This is a DSS established objective. The federal agency, Administration for Children & Families, gathers data on this measure, but has not established a numerical objective.

Site Visit Findings		Performance Item Ratings				
Permanency Item 7: Permanency goal for children.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	

Explanation

This is a “Strength” for Hampton DSS. To meet the criteria established in the CAPSS report 53.00% or more of the children in care 15 of the most recent 22 months must have a TPR petition filed. If DSS does not pursue TPR for a child in foster care for 15 of the past 22 months, there should be a compelling reason for not doing so. Although only 25% (2/8) of the Hampton DSS foster children in care 15 or more of the last 22 months met this quantitative standard, the on-site reviewers determined that all 10 cases they reviewed had realistic goals and reasonable progress was being made by the families to warrant continuing those goals.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Analysis of Safety Permanency Item 8 Findings

<u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u>				
Measure P3.3: Length of Time to Achieve Reunification – 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 Foster Care Services Closed. Last Plan Was Return Home 02/01/05 – 01/31/06	Number of Children In Care Less Than 12 Months	Number Of Children Objective $\geq 76.20\%*$	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	2012	1691	1533.14	157.86
Hampton	11	11	8.38	2.62

* This is a federally established objective.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	100	0	0	4	

Explanation

This is a “Strength” for Hampton DSS. To meet this federally establish criteria at least 76.20% of the children returned to their parents from foster care must be returned within 12 months of their removal from home. In Hampton County, 100% of the children that returned home during the period under review were returned home within a year of removal.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Analysis of Permanency Item 9 Findings

<u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u>				
Measure P3.4: Length of Time to Achieve Adoption – 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 W/in 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	365	53	116.80	(63.80)
Hampton	1	1	0.32	0.68

Note: This is a federally established objective.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 9: Adoption.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	0	0	0	0	10	

Explanation

This is a “Strength” for Hampton County DSS. To meet this federally established objective 32% of the adoptions in a county must be completed within 24 months of the children entering care. The outcome report shows that 1 adoption was completed during the 12-month period under review and that adoption was completed within 24 months of the children entering care (100%). None of the cases reviewed on site involved children with a plan of adoption.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Analysis of Permanency Item 10 Findings

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure P3.6: **Permanency Goal of “Other Planned Living Arrangement”** – Of all children in foster care, the percent with a permanency goal of emancipation (Independent Living Services), or a planned permanent living arrangement other than adoption, guardianship, or return to family.

	Number of Children In Care at Least One Day 02/01/05 – 01/31/06	Number of Children In Care With Perm Plan “Other Planned Living Arrangement”	Number of Children Objective $\geq 85.00\%$ *	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	8,105	1,067	6889.25	148.75
Hampton	30	0	25.50	4.50

* This is a DSS established objective.

Site Visit Findings

Performance Item Ratings

Permanency Item 10: Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	100	0	0	6	

Explanation

This is a “Strength” for Hampton DSS. The standard for this objective is that no more than 15% of the children in foster care should have this plan. The Strategic Outcome report indicated that Hampton DSS did not have any foster children with a permanency plan of “Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement” (APPLA) but reviewers found contradictions in foster care records. Two foster care cases were found where the narrative in CAPSS indicated the plan was “Independent Living” with documentation indicating that the worker was having discussions with the foster child about “Independent Living”. The permanency plans entered into the legal section of CAPSS were “Return Home”. The records of two other foster children, including the documentation in CAPSS, clearly indicated that the permanency plans for the foster children were “Permanent Long Term Foster Care”. In all four of the foster care cases the “Independent Living” and “Permanent Long Term Foster Care” plans and services seemed appropriate to help the children achieve their goals.

Even though this was a strength for the county, improvements should be made in CAPSS data entry to ensure that current and accurate permanency goals are entered for all foster children.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Section Four

Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

Summary of Findings

Overall Finding:

Partially Achieved

-Item 11: Proximity of placement	Finding: Strength
-Item 12: Placement with siblings	Finding: Area Needing Improvement
-Item 13: Visiting w/ parents & siblings	Finding: Area Needing Improvement
-Item 14: Preserving connections	Finding: Area Needing Improvement
-Item 15: Relative placement	Finding: Strength
-Item 16: Relationship of child w/ parents	Finding: Area Needing Improvement

Note

This outcome was only partially achieved, with four of the six performance ratings rated as an “Area Needing Improvement”. This was generally caused by the county not doing enough to serve two sibling groups involving two foster children each. A more detailed description of the problems can be found below in each the performance ratings for this outcome.

Analysis of Permanency Item 11 Findings

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure P4.1: **Proximity 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 02/01/05 – 01/31/06	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	6,022	3,891	64.61	4,215.40	(324.40)
Hampton	30	20	66.67	21.00	(1.00)

* This is a DSS established objective.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

<u>Site Visit Findings</u>		Performance Item Ratings				
Permanency Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	100	0	0	2	

Explanation

This is a “Strength” for Hampton DSS. To meet this objective 70% or more of the children in care must be placed in Hampton County. Although the outcome report indicates that 67% (20 of 30) of the children in foster care were placed in the county, the reviewers found that 100% of the applicable foster children reviewed were either placed within Hampton County or were in close proximity of Hampton County in an adjacent county. Two of the foster children reviewed were rated as “not applicable” because their parents’ parental rights were terminated and there was no planned involvement of their parents in the children’s cases.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u>		Performance Item Ratings				
Permanency Item 12: Placement with siblings						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	75	2	25	2	

Explanation

This is an “Area Needing Improvement” for Hampton DSS. It was apparent that the agency attempted to place siblings together when resources and circumstances allowed. The on-site review revealed two foster children that were originally placed with each other then one was moved to provide a respite for the foster parent. Six months later the children were still in separate foster homes.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u>		Performance Item Ratings				
Permanency Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	60	4	40	0	

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Explanation

This is an “Area Needing Improvement” for Hampton DSS. The four cases rated “Area Needing Improvement” involved two groups of siblings. One record contained documentation that an older brother and sister often asked about each other, they stated they missed each other, and requested visits with their sibling; but, there was no evidence those visits occurred. The other group of siblings did not appear to be visiting with their parents as required.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u>		Performance Item Ratings					
Permanency Item 14: Preserving connections							
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	5	62.5	3	37.5	2		

Explanation

This is an “Area Needing Improvement” for Hampton DSS. This item addresses the agency’s ability to preserve a foster child’s connection to his/her community, family, and faith. Five of the applicable eight cases reviewed were rated “Strength” for this item. This means that in most, but not all cases, the agency tried to help children in foster care maintain relationships that were important to them. One sibling group in foster care had another sibling that was placed with the biological father. There was no evidence that contact was maintained with that sibling. Also, those children had extended family that had been important to them in the past but it did not appear that contact was maintained after they entered foster care.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u>		Performance Item Ratings					
Permanency Item 15: Relative placement							
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0		

Explanation

This is a “Strength” for Hampton DSS. This item addresses the agency’s effectiveness in identifying and assessing the relatives of children in foster care as possible caregivers. In 9 of the 10 foster care cases, both maternal and paternal relatives were assessed as placement options. In the 1 case rated “Area Needing Improvement” there was no evidence that relatives were assessed.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

<u>Site Visit Findings</u>		Performance Item Ratings				
Permanency Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	50	4	50	2	

Explanation

This is an “Area Needing Improvement” for Hampton DSS. This item addresses the agency’s effectiveness in promoting or maintaining a strong emotionally supportive relationship between children in care and their parents. Four of the applicable eight cases were rated a “Strength” because in those cases provisions were made for parents to be involved in their children’s lives beyond the minimum visitation required by policy.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Section Five

Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

Summary of Findings

Overall Finding:

Not Achieved

-Item 17: Needs & services

Finding: Area Needing Improvement

-Item 18: Involvement in case planning

Finding: Area Needing Improvement

-Item 19: Worker visits with child

Finding: Area Needing Improvement

-Item 20: Worker visits with parent(s)

Finding: Area Needing Improvement

<u>Site Visit Findings</u>		Performance Item Ratings					
Well Being Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents							
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0		
Treatment	8	80	2	20	0		
Total Cases	17	85	3	15	0		

Explanation

This item asks two questions: 1) Were the needs of the child, parents, and foster parents assessed, and 2) Did the agency take steps to meet the identified needs? Even though 85 percent of the cases reviewed were strong in this area, **this is an "Area Needing Improvement" for Hampton DSS.** Generally, workers provided services that enabled families to improve functioning and meet the minimally acceptable needs of their children. In all three cases where this was determined an "Area Needing Improvement", the worker assessed and provided adequate services to the child but not to the parents.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u>		Performance Item Ratings					
Well Being Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning							
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	8	88.9	1	11.1	1		
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0		
Total Cases	15	78.9	4	21.1	1		

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Explanation

This is an “Area Needing Improvement” for Hampton DSS. Most of the cases contained documentation to show that the parents/caretakers and children, when age appropriate, were involved in the development of the case plans. The few exceptions in the treatment cases were usually due to the worker not involving the parent that was not in the caretaker role which was normally the biological father. The foster care case rated as “Area Needing Improvement” was one of the four children already discussed above in “Permanency Outcome 2”. The county faithfully visited the child and discussed how the child was getting along in foster care and school but there was no documentation in the records to show that the county was involving this teenage foster child when planning services.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u>		Performance Item Ratings				
Well Being Item 19: Worker visits with child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	
Treatment	7	70	3	30	0	
Total Cases	17	85	3	15	0	

Explanation

This is an “Area Needing Improvement” for Hampton DSS. This rating is based on two questions: 1) were Hampton DSS staff visiting children according to policy, and 2) did the visits focus on issues related to the treatment plan? All ten of the foster children reviewed were seen monthly, often in the schools. Seven of the ten treatment cases documented monthly visits with all the children in the case. One of the three treatment cases without monthly visitation did not document visits with the child in three of the six months in the period under review. When visits were documented workers almost always discussed the conditions at the child’s home and the child’s performance in school.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u>		Performance Item Ratings				
Well Being Item 20: Worker visits with parent(s)						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	57.1	3	42.9	3	
Treatment	5	50	5	50	0	
Total Cases	9	52.9	8	47.1	3	

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Explanation

This is an “Area Needing Improvement” for Hampton DSS. Monthly visits with the parents / caretakers were documented in a little more than ½ of the cases reviewed for all the months in the period under review. In the other cases, monthly visits with the parents/caretakers were documented in almost all of the months in the period under review with the exception of one case. In that case, the mother was incarcerated and the worker did not visit with the caretakers in three of the six months reviewed.

Section Six

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

Summary of Findings

Overall Finding:

Substantially Achieved

-Item 21: Educational needs of child

Finding: Strength

<u>Site Visit Findings</u>		Performance Item Ratings					
Well Being Item 21: Educational needs of child							
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	5	100	0	0	5		
Treatment	6	100	0	0	4		
Total Cases	11	100	0	0	9		

Explanation

This is a “Strength” for Hampton DSS. This item asks two questions: 1) Did DSS assess the educational needs of the children under their supervision, and 2) Were identified educational needs addressed? The answer to both questions is “Yes” for all of the cases reviewed in Hampton DSS. Reviewers saw documentation of frequent visits with children in their schools, discussions with the children of their performances in schools, and copies of school documents in DSS records. Reviewers found one child that had been involved with drugs and had not been attending school for about a year when DSS got involved with his family. This child ended up getting his GED and joining the National Guard, which seemed to be a success story.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Section Seven

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

Summary of Findings

Overall Finding:

Substantially Achieved

-Item 22: Physical health of the child

Finding: Strength

-Item 23: Mental health of the child

Finding: Strength

<u>Site Visit Findings</u>		Performance Item Ratings					
Well Being Item 22: Physical health of the child							
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0		
Treatment	10	100	0	0	0		
Total Cases	19	95	1	5	0		

Explanation

This is a “Strength” for Hampton DSS. It was evident that the medical needs of children in treatment and foster care cases were consistently assessed and appropriate services provided.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u>		Performance Item Ratings					
Well Being Item 23: Mental health of the child							
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Foster Care	6	100	0	0	4		
Treatment	4	100	0	0	6		
Total Cases	10	100	0	0	10		

Explanation

This is a “Strength” for Hampton DSS. The reviewers found that the mental health needs of all of the children reviewed were appropriately served in Hampton County; although, a number of the stakeholders that were interviewed questioned if assessments for the mental health and emotional well-being of children and their mothers were thorough. Stakeholders described a difference in the availability of mental health services among the school districts in Hampton

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

County. They felt that children in Hampton 2 were better served by the school-based counseling services.

Section Eight – Foster Home Licenses

This is a **“Strength”** for Hampton DSS. At the time of the onsite review Hampton DSS had 15 licensed foster homes. Ten foster home records were reviewed.

1. All 10 Foster Home Licenses reviewed were current.
2. All fire inspections were current.
3. Almost all of the licensing requirements for household members were current with the exception of 1 license that did not have all the required training hours.
4. Quarterly visits were timely and documented in CAPSS.
5. Licenses contained supervisory checklists and the dictation was current in all licenses.

The foster homes are being managed appropriately.

Section Nine – Unfounded Investigations

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Investigation initiated timely?	2	3
Was assessment adequate?	5	0
Was decision appropriate?	5	0

This is a “Strength” for Hampton DSS. The reviewers found that all five of the unfounded investigations had an adequate assessment and the case decision appeared appropriate. One problem the reviewers found was that two of the five investigations were initiated later than the response time the county determined appropriate based on the risk rating at intake. The county rated one investigation medium risk at intake and determined that it should be initiated within 2 to 12 hours but it was initiated over 23 hours after intake. All of the unfounded investigations reviewed were initiated within 24 hours, as required by state law.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Section Ten – Screened-out Intakes

	Yes	No	Cannot Determine
Was intake appropriately screened-out?	5	2	0
	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Were necessary collaterals contacted?	0	0	7
Were appropriate referrals made?	1	3	3

Explanation: Not all calls to the Department of Social Services alleging child abuse or neglect meet the legal definition of abuse or neglect. Those calls are screened out and not investigated. The table above contains the findings of a reviewer who examined all seven referrals screened-out during the period under review.

This is an “Area Needing Improvement” for Hampton DSS. The reviewers found that two of the seven referrals screened-out for investigation should have been accepted and investigated. The screening section on the intake form was not adequately completed on both of those screened-out referrals. This section should be used as a tool to assist in decision making. The entire intake form should be thoroughly completed before determining whether to accept or screen-out a referral. One of the referrals should have been accepted based on the history of referrals, the age of the newborn grandchild and the young mother’s (14 years old) relationship with her mother. A second referral did not have enough information to screen it out for investigation. Again, the screening tools on the intake form were not adequately completed. Questions were left blank and in some cases appear to be answered incorrectly. A more thorough assessment at intake would more than likely have resulted in the referrals being accepted for investigation.

**Hampton County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
March 2006**

Hampton Case Rating Summary

The performance and outcome ratings below show the number of cases receiving that rating, followed by the percent of the total that number represents. Not Applicable (N/A) cases do not factor in the percentage.

Performance Item or Outcome	Perf. Item Ratings			Outcome Ratings (% does not include N/A)			
	Strength	Area Needing Improvement	N/A*	Substantially Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved	N/A*
Outcome S1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.				20 (100%)	0	0	0
Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	3	0	17				
Item 2: Repeat maltreatment	20	0	0				
Outcome S2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.				20 (100%)	0	0	0
Item 3: Services to family to protect child (ren) in home and prevent removal	12	0	8				
Item 4: Risk of harm to child (ren)	20	0	0				
Outcome P1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.				10 (100%)	0	0	0
Item 5: Foster care re-entries	1	0	9				
Item 6: Stability of foster care placement	9	1	0				
Item 7: Permanency goal for child	10	0	0				
Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	6	0	4				
Item 9: Adoption	0	0	10				
Item 10: Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement	4	0	6				
Outcome P2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.				5 (50%)	5 (50%)	0	0
Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement	8	0	2				
Item 12: Placement with siblings	6	2	2				
Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	6	4	0				
Item 14: Preserving connections	5	3	2				
Item 15: Relative placement	9	1	0				
Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents	4	4	2				
Outcome WB1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.				14 (70%)	6 (30%)	0	0
Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents	17	3	0				
Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning	15	4	1				
Item 19: Worker visits with child	17	3	0				
Item 20: Worker visits with parent(s)	9	8	3				
Outcome WB2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.				11 (100%)	0	0	9
Item 21: Educational needs of the child	11	0	9				
Outcome WB3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.				19 (95%)	1 (5%)	0	0
Item 22: Physical health of the child	19	1	0				
Item 23: Mental health of the child	10	0	10				