

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

During the week of May 22 through May 26, 2006 a team of DSS staff from state office and surrounding counties conducted an onsite review of child welfare services in Marlboro 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, Marlboro DSS supervisors, representatives from the schools, Foster Care Review Board, Mental Health and Guardian Ad Litem Program.

Period included in Case Record Review: Nov. 1, 2005 – April 30, 2006

Period included in Outcome Measures: April 1, 2005 to April 30, 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.

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 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.

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure S1.1: Timeliness of initiating investigations on reports of child maltreatment
Data Time Period: 5/1/05 to 4/30/06

	Number of Reports Accepted	Number of Investigations Initiated Timely	Number of Investigations Objective 100%*	Number of Investigations Above (Below) Objective
State	16,328	15,784	16,328	(544)
Marlboro	137	137	137	

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

Onsite Review Findings

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

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	100	0	0	9	0
Treatment	6	100	0	0	4	0
Total Cases	7	100	0	0	12	0

Explanation of Item 1

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro DSS. This rating is based on the findings from the agency's outcome report and findings from the onsite review. Every investigation was initiated within the timeframes established in agency policy. Since the time allowed for initiating an investigation varies depending upon the level of risk assigned to the case, onsite reviewers looked at the accuracy of the risk ratings. Reviewers found that the agency consistently assigned risks ratings appropriately. Cases with a high risk were consistently initiated within two hours of the intake.

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

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 six month period.

Indicated Reports Between October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005

	Number of Child Victims	Number of Child Victims In Another Founded Report	Number of Children Objective < 90%	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	10,218	52	9594.7	571.30
Marlboro	148	0	138.97	9.03

Note: This is a federally established objective.

Onsite Review Findings

Safety Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment.

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	9	90	1	10	0	0
Total Cases	19	95	1	10	0	0

Explanation of Item 2

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro DSS. Based on the data from the outcome report and the findings from the onsite review. The outcome report counts cases with additional indicated reports within the period under review. Onsite reviewers use information documented in the case file to determine if the children under agency care are experiencing additional abuse or neglect, whether that additional abuse results in another indicated report or not. Reviewers found that the county did an excellent job of ensuring that children under agency supervision are not experience additional maltreatment.

Section Two

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

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

Onsite Review Findings 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	1	100	0	0	9	0
Treatment	9	90	1	10	0	0
Total Cases	10	91	1	9	9	0

Explanation of Item 3

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro DSS. Most of the foster care cases were rated not applicable because the children entered care prior to the period under the review. However, the decision to remove those children from their homes and place them in foster care was consistently correct. The onsite review and CAPSS confirmed that the agency offered appropriate services to the family to protect children in the home.

Strategic Outcome Report Findings				
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 Rept 11/1/05 to 10/31/06	Number With Another Rept Within 6 Months of Unfounded Determination	Number of Cases Met Objective $\geq 91.50\%$ *	Number of Cases Above (Below) Objective
State	14,753	1,108	13,498.99	13.7
Marlboro	724	59	662.46	2.5

* This is a DSS established objective.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Safety Item 4: Risk of harm.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	8	80	2	20	0	0
Total Cases	18	90	2	10	0	0

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

Explanation of Item 4

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro DSS. Onsite reviewers found that the risk of harm to children in 90% of the cases was reduced as a result of DSS intervention. Risk of harm was not reduced in two treatment cases. In one of those cases, risk of harm was not reduced because the agency took too long to establish a treatment plan that dealt with the risk factors in the home.

Stakeholder Comment: The stakeholders' comments regarding the agency's ability to reduce risk of harm were generally favorable and confirmed the onsite findings.

DSS generally makes good decisions about child safety. If anything, they are overcautious. They protect children as well, and don't make premature decisions. "There is a pretty good group here."

Section Three

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

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 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 $\geq 91.40\%*$	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	3,213	243	2936.68	33.32
Marlboro	14	0	12.8	1.20

*This is a federally established objective.

Explanation of Item 5

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro DSS. Both the outcome report and findings from the onsite review indicate that children re-entering foster care within a year of discharge was not a problem for this DSS office.

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

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 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	3,810	3,080	3,303.27	-223.27
Marlboro	38	32	32.95	-0.95

Explanation of Item 6

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marlboro DSS. The federal standard for stability of foster care placements is at least 86.7% of the children in care have less than two placements in the past year. With 32 of 38 (84%) children in Marlboro County having less than two placements, the agency missed this federal standard by a slight margin. Onsite reviewers found that the children most likely to experience multiple placements were teenagers with conduct disorders.

Stakeholder Comment:

Children move around. Mr. Fogle brings this up at interagency meetings which take place once a month. They do communicate well with DSS. The lack of foster homes is a severe problem.

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

(Measure P1.5): 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 011/1/2005 – 10/31/2006	Number Children With TPR Complaint	Number of Children Objective ≥ 53.00%*	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	2,326	1,946	1772.41	173.59
Marlboro	28	25	21.34	3.66

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

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

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

Explanation of Item 7

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro DSS. To assess the agency's effectiveness in pursuing permanency, the outcome report and the onsite reviewers consider related, but different information. The outcome report requires that 53% or more of the children in care 15 of the most recent 22 months have a TPR petition filed. For Marlboro DSS that percentage is 89. Onsite reviewers determined that the permanency plans for each of the cases reviewed were appropriate.

<u>Strategic Outcome Report Findings</u>				
(Measure P1.3): Length of time to achieve reunification – Of all children who were reunited with their parents or relatives at the time of discharge from foster care, what percentage were reunited in less than 12 months from their latest removal from home?				
	Number of Children Where Foster Care Services Closed Last Plan was Return Home 6/01/05 – 5-31-06	Number Children Returned Home In Less Than 12 Months	Number of Children Objective $\geq 76.20\%$ *	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	2,383	1,990	1,815.85	174.15
Marlboro	30	27	22.86	4.14

*This is a federally established objective.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives.						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	4	100	0	0	6	0

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

Explanation of Item 8

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro DSS. The federal standard for this item is that at least 76.20% of children returned to their parents be returned within 12 months of entering care. Marlboro DSS returned 90% (27/30) of its children home within 12 months. Reviewers determined that the plan of return home was appropriate for each of the children with that plan.

<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 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	363	47	116.16	69.16
Marlboro	9	1	11.11	-1.88

Note: This is a federally established objective.

Explanation of Item 9

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marlboro DSS. Only one of the nine adoptions completed within the period under review was completed within 24 months of the child entering care. However, for a county that sent 90% of its children home within a year, and served 53 children in foster care, completing nine adoptions in one year was an exceptional feat. It indicates that the children who remained in care more than a year, had been in care for a long time. It also indicates that the agency was focused on helping those children experiencing long term foster care to achieve permanency.

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

Strategic Outcome Report Findings

Measure P1.6: **Permanency Goal of “Other Planned Living Arrangement”** – 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	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	7,860	1,240	6,681	-61
Marlboro	53	16	45.05	-1.05

* This is a DSS established objective.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings

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

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	50	1	50	9	0

Explanation of Item 10

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marlboro DSS. The standard for this objective is that no more than 15% of the children in foster care should have the plan, Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA). According to the outcome report the county missed the objective by one youth. Of the two cases reviewed with this plan, one needed improvement because the youth’s poor academic performance indicated the need for a vocational assessment as part of an independent living services plan. However, the youth was not receiving independent living services.

Section Four

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

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

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	Number of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Percent of Children Placed Within County of Origin	Number of Children Objective $\geq 70.00\%$ *	Number of Children Above (Below) Objective
State	6,034	3,415	64.83	4,227.3	-312.30
Marlboro	57	40	70.18	39.9	.1

* This is a DSS established objective.

Explanation of Item 11

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro DSS. The outcome standard is that at least 70% of the children in care must be placed within the county. The outcome report shows that 70.18% of Marlboro County children are placed within the county. Onsite reviewers found that children placed outside of the county were in need of therapeutic placements that did not exist within the county.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings

Permanency Item 12: Placement with siblings

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

Explanation of Item 12

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro DSS. The county did an excellent job of placing siblings together whenever appropriate. All of the sibling groups that should have been placed together were placed together.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings

Permanency Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	3	50	3	50	4	0

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

Explanation of Item 13

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marlboro DSS. Reviewers determine if the agency is providing at least two visits with the parents (when applicable) and helping to facilitate visitation with siblings in foster care. Half of the cases failed to meet this agency requirement because visitation was not conducted consistently on a monthly basis.

Stakeholder Comment:

The agency needs to put more training emphasis on how to work with difficult people and cases, rather than on paperwork and forms.

<u>Site Visit Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 14: Preserving connections						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	100	0	0	5	0

Explanation of Item 14

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro DSS. This item addresses the agency's ability to preserve a child's connection to the people, places and things that are important to him (while the child is in foster care). Even though several Marlboro children were placed in adjacent counties, that was not a barrier to the agency helping those children maintain the relationships that were important to them.

<u>Onsite Review Findings</u> Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 15: Relative placement						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	88	1	12	1	

Explanation of Item 15

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro DSS. The case records contained evidence of diligent searches for non-custodial parents. Workers consistently approached both paternal and maternal relatives to determine if any were willing and able to care for the children in foster care placements.

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Permanency Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	25	3	75	6	0

Explanation of Item 16

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marlboro DSS. This item addresses the agency's effectiveness in promoting or maintaining a strong emotionally supportive relationship between children in care and their parents. Most of the cases were rated not applicable because in many of the cases reviewed onsite, the parental rights were terminated or maintaining contact with the parents was not in the child's best interests. The cases rated area needing improvement lacked evidence of parental involvement beyond the minimally required two visits per month. Based on the otherwise high quality of casework being done, it appeared that the deficiency resulted from a failure to document this activity.

Section Five

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

Site Visit Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Well Being Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	5	55	4	15	1	0
Treatment	6	60	4	40	0	0
Total Cases	11	58	8	42	1	0

Explanation of Item 17

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marlboro 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? The findings in both treatment cases and foster care cases were comparable. In several cases, reviewers found that the needs of fathers were not addressed in the treatment plans. In another case, the needs of children were not assessed in the treatment plan.

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

Stakeholder Comments: “Treatment plans are too often unrealistic given the rural poverty and unemployment in the county. Transportation is a big problem and employment is often hours away. Requirements that clients attend multiple classes and sessions in three months are a setup for failure. DSS needs to help people more. Most of the time, people don’t know how to accomplish their plans.”

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Well Being Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	6	60	4	40		0
Treatment	6	60	4	40		0
Total Cases	12	60	8	40		0

Explanation of Item 18

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marlboro DSS. Foster Care and treatment cases equally needed improvement for this item. Reviewers found that fathers were not consistently involved in the development of treatment plans. It appeared that the general practice was for caseworkers to develop treatment plans with their supervisor and present the plan to clients for their signatures. In one case, a father actually had physical custody of his child but was not included in the family’s assessment or treatment plan because the worker was focused on the mother.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Well Being Item 19: Worker visits with child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	9	90	1	10	0	0
Treatment	9	90	1	10	0	0
Total Cases	18	90	2	10	0	0

Explanation of Item 19

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro DSS. This rating is based on two questions: 1) Were Marlboro DSS staff visiting children according to policy; and 2) Did the visits focus on issues related to the treatment plan? The agency’s database, CAPSS, and the case records show that monthly visits with all children in the cases were consistently done. Dictation showed that workers addressed relevant treatment related issues during their visits with the children.

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

Stakeholder Comments: The staff is very hard working and they do well with limited resources. Services are individually tailored and he/she is impressed with the current group at DSS.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Well Being Item 20: Worker visits with parent(s)						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	1	33	2	64	7	0
Treatment	9	90	1	10	0	0
Total Cases	10	77	3	23	7	0

Explanation of Item 20

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marlboro DSS. In foster care, 7 of 10 cases were not applicable because the agency had been relieved of providing services/visits for the parents. Because of a tendency to focus on the custodial parent, workers sometimes failed to work with a non-custodial parent, even when the non-custodial parent was directly involved in the child's life.

Section Six

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

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings						
Well Being Item 21: Educational needs of child						
	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	8	88	1	12	1	0
Treatment	9	100	0	0	1	0
Total Cases	17	94	1	6	2	0

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

Explanation of Item 21

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro 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 was almost always “Yes” in the foster care and treatment cases.

Section Seven

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

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings

Well Being Item 22: Physical health of the child

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	10	100	0	0	0	0
Treatment	9	100	0	0	1	0
Total Cases	19	100	0	0	1	0

Explanation of Item 22

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro County. In every case the medical needs of every child was thoroughly and regularly assessed. Workers followed up on identified medical issues to ensure that clients received needed medical care.

Onsite Review Findings Performance Item Ratings

Well Being Item 23: Mental health of the child

	Strength		Area Needing Improvement		Not Applicable	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Foster Care	7	100	0	0	3	0
Treatment	4	100	0	0	6	0
Total Cases	11	100	0	0	9	0

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

Explanation of Item 23

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro DSS. In every case the mental health needs of every child was thoroughly and regularly assessed. The public mental health provider was not staffed, and consequently not capable of providing mental health services for the agency's clients. The agency used private providers in neighboring counties. This sometimes created a hardship for clients, and made compliance with treatment plan requirements unrealistic.

Mental Health Stakeholder: Coordinating services is challenging due to staff shortages. Foster parents may feel that they don't have on-going support, and they don't receive the kind of training they need to deal with some of the kids they get.

Section Eight – Foster Home Licenses

This is an area of **Strength** for Marlboro County DSS.

Strengths

- All of the foster home licenses reviewed were current
- Licensing requirements were well documented and in compliance with established procedures

Areas Needing Improvement

- Dictation in the licensing records was not always thorough. Issues that were discussed during quarterly visits were not clearly documented. In some records summaries of placements were not clearly documented.

Screened Out Intakes

	Yes	No	Cannot Determine
Was Intake Appropriately Screened Out?	7	2	0
	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Were Necessary Collaterals Contacted?	3	1	5
Were Appropriate Referrals Made?	2	1	6

This is an **Area Needing Improvement** for Marlboro County DSS. Both of the referrals that reviewers determined were not appropriately screened-out for investigation had multiple reports before these reports were screened-out. Also, both referrals had intakes after the two were screened-out that were later accepted for investigation.

**Marlboro County DSS
Child Welfare Services Review
May 2006**

Onsite Review Rating Summary			
Performance Item or Outcome	Performance Item Ratings		
	Strength	Area Needing Improvement	N/A *
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.			
Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	7/7 = 100%	0	13
Item 2: Repeat maltreatment	19/20 = 95%	1/20 = 5%	0
Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.			
Item 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal	10/11 = 91%	1/11 = 9%	9
Item 4: Risk of harm to child(ren)	18/20 = 90%	2/20 = 10%	0
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.			
Item 5: Foster care re-entries	1/1 = 100%	0	9
Item 6: Stability of foster care placement	9/10 = 90%	1/10 = 10%	0
Item 7: Permanency goal for child	10/10 = 100%	0	0
Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	4/4 = 100%	0	6
Item 9: Adoption	0	4/4 = 100%	6
Item 10: Permanency goal of Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA)	1/2 = 50%	1/2 = 50%	8
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.			
Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement	4/4 = 100%	0	6
Item 12: Placement with siblings	6/6 = 100%	0	4
Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	3/6 = 50%	3/6 = 50%	4
Item 14: Preserving connections	5/5 = 100%	0	5
Item 15: Relative placement	8/9 = 89%	1/9 = 11%	1
Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents	1/4 = 25%	3/4 = 75%	6
Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.			
Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, caregiver	11/19 = 58%	8/19 = 42%	1
Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning	12/20 = 60%	8/20 = 40%	0
Item 19: Worker visits with child	18/20 = 90%	2/20 = 10%	0
Item 20: Worker visits with parent(s)	10/13 = 77%	3/13 = 23%	7
Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.			
Item 21: Educational needs of the child	17/18 = 94%	1/18 = 6%	2
Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.			
Item 22: Physical health of the child	19/19 = 100%	0	1
Item 23: Mental health of the child	11/11 = 100%	0	9