

South Carolina Department of Social Services
Child Welfare Quality Assurance Review: Richland County

This report describes the results of the South Carolina Department of Social Services (DSS) Richland County Quality Assurance Review, conducted September 4-7, 2012.

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

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

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

Outcome	Substantially Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
Safety 1 <i>Children Are, First and Foremost, Protected from Abuse and Neglect</i>	40%(2)	20%(1)	40%(2)
Safety 2 <i>Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate</i>	50%(10)	15%(3)	35%(7)
Permanency 1 <i>Children have permanency and stability in their living situations</i>	0%(0)	100%(10)	0%(0)
Permanency 2 <i>The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children</i>	60%(6)	30%(3)	10%(1)
Well-Being 1 <i>Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children’s needs</i>	40%(8)	30%(6)	30%(6)
Well-Being 2 <i>Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs</i>	83.3%(5)	16.7%(1)	0%(0)
Well-Being 3 <i>Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs</i>	64.3%(9)	14.3%(2)	21.4%(3)

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

Twenty cases were reviewed including ten foster care and ten in-home treatment cases.

SECTION I: REVIEW FINDINGS

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

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

Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations

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

Table 2.

Rating	Item 1	Item 2
Strength	10%(2)	15%(3)
Area needing improvement	15%(3)	5%(1)
Not Applicable	75%(15)	80%(16)
Total	100%(20)	100%(20)
% Strengths	40%(2)	75%(3)

Item 2: Repeat maltreatment

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

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

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

Item 3: Services to family

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

Table 3.

Rating	Item 3	Item 4
Strength	20%(4)	55%(11)
Area needing improvement	35%(7)	45%(9)
Not Applicable	45%(9)	0%(0)
Total	100%(20)	100%(20)
% Strengths	36.4%(4)	55%(11)

Item 4: Risk assessment and safety management

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

Permanency Outcome 1: Children have Permanency and Stability in their Living Situations

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

Item 5: Foster Care reentries

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

Item 6: Stability of foster care placement

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

Item 7: Permanency goal for child

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

Item 8: Reunification, guardianship or permanent placement with relatives

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

Item 9: Adoption

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

Item 10: Other planned permanent living arrangement (APPLA)

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

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

Table 4.

Rating	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9	Item 10
Strength	5%(1)	45%(9)	10%(2)	5%(1)	0%(0)	10%(2)
Area needing improvement	0%(0)	5%(1)	40%(8)	5%(1)	25%(5)	5%(1)
Not Applicable	95%(19)	50%(10)	50%(10)	90%(18)	75%(15)	85%(17)
Total	100%(20)	100%(20)	100%(20)	100%(20)	100%(20)	100%(20)
% Strengths	100%(1)	90%(9)	20%(2)	50%(1)	0%(0)	66.7%(2)

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

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

Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement

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

Item 12: Placement with siblings

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

Item 13: Visiting with parents & siblings in foster care

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

Item 14: Preserving connections

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

Item 15: Relative placement

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

Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents

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

Table 5.

Rating	Item 11	Item 12	Item 13	Item 14	Item 15	Item 16
Strength	20%(4)	10%(2)	10%(2)	35%(7)	25%(5)	5%(1)
Area needing improvement	0%(0)	5%(1)	10%(2)	10%(2)	15%(3)	15%(3)
Not Applicable	80%(16)	85%(17)	80%(16)	55%(11)	60%(12)	80%(16)
Total	100%(20)	100%(20)	100%(20)	100%(20)	100%(20)	100%(20)
% Strengths	100%(4)	66.7%(2)	50%(2)	77.8%(7)	62.5%(12)	25%(1)

Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have Enhanced Capacity to Provide for their Children’s Needs

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

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

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

Item 18: Child & family involvement in case planning

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

Item 19: Caseworker visits with the child

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

Item 20: Caseworker visits with parents

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

Table 6.

Rating	Item 17	Item 18	Item 19	Item 20
Strength	40%(8)	35%(7)	65%(13)	10%(2)
Area needing improvement	60%(12)	50%(10)	35%(7)	60%(12)
Not Applicable	0%(0)	15%(3)	0%(0)	30%(6)
Total	100%(20)	100%(20)	100%(20)	100%(20)
% Strengths	40%(8)	41.2%(7)	65%(13)	14.3%(2)

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

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

Item 21: Educational needs of child

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

Table 7.

Rating	Item 21
Strength	25%(5)
Area needing improvement	5%(1)
Not Applicable	70%(14)
Total	100%(20)
% Strengths	83.3%(5)

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

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

Item 22: Physical health of child

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

Item 23: Mental/behavioral health of child

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

Table 8.

Rating	Item 22	Item 23
<i>Strength</i>	30%(6)	40%(8)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	25%(5)	5%(1)
Not Applicable	45%(9)	55%(11)
Total	100%(20)	100%(20)
<i>% Strengths</i>	54.5%(6)	88.9%(8)

Summary

Many positives were found with the cases. *Items* 5 and 11 were identified as strengths of the agency because all of the cases reviewed were rated as *strengths* with no *areas needing improvement*. This means that for the cases reviewed, no children returned to foster care during the PUR and concerted efforts were made to ensure siblings were placed together where possible. For *item* 19 all of the foster care cases were rated as *strengths*. *Item* 23 was rated as a *strength* for eight of the nine applicable cases. Reviewers noted in one case that permanency was achieved for the child within one month of receiving the clearance letter. The target child remained in the same home from the time she entered care until she was adopted by her foster parent.

Reviewers identified several concerns. There were four cases in the treatment area with all *ANI* ratings, no *strengths* were noted. *Items* 17, 18, and 20 were mostly rated *ANIs* in the treatment area. In the foster care area, only 1 to 2 cases were applicable on *items* 1, 2, and 3. All of these cases were rated *ANI*.

SECTION II: FOSTER CARE LICENSE REVIEW

As part of the Quality Assurance Review Process in Richland County, ten Foster Home Licenses were randomly selected from the list of all licenses issued by the county during the period under review. These licenses were reviewed using the *SC Department of Social Services Foster License Review Instrument*. This instrument consists of three sections. Section One focuses on the issuance of the Initial/Standard License. Section Two focuses on the standard license renewal process. Section Three focuses on agency oversight, data entry, and qualitative issues. Each section of the instrument includes the appropriate agency, state, and federal requirements.

Section One review criteria include the following *items*:

- applications
- autobiography information
- financial information
- child factor's checklists
- initial home assessment studies
- references
- information related to firearms and ammunition in the house
- pet vaccination information
- background checks
- convictions
- required trainings
- medical reports
- fire inspections/re-inspections
- discipline agreements
- disaster preparedness plans
- alternative caregiver forms
- a review of any conflicts noted between file documents and CAPSS

Section Two review criteria include the following *items*:

- a review of the initial background checks
- convictions
- training hours
- medical reports
- updated home studies
- discipline agreements
- fire inspections and drills
- quarterly home visits
- disaster preparedness plans
- annual firearms location update
- information concerning the alternative caregivers
- safety checks of alternative caregivers,
- a review of child protective service allegations
- pet vaccination information
- a review of any regulatory infractions
- a review of any conflicts noted between file documents and CAPSS

All of the requirements evaluated in Sections One and Two of this instrument must be met for the foster home license to be valid. If any *items* are rated as not met, the foster home license is considered invalid. Federal funds cannot be used for board payments for any foster children in the home during the time the license was invalid. Areas noted as having occurred as required on the assessment are rated as *strengths*. Those *items* that were not met are rated as an *area needing improvement (ANI)*. If the issue is not applicable, it is rated N/A.

Additionally, the percentage of *strengths* is also calculated for each *item*. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Results of the review in Richland County are noted in Table 9.

Section One is rated as an area of *strength*. Two initial licenses were reviewed and all licensing requirements were met per policy prior to the issuance of the initial license.

Table 9. Summary of Ratings for Sections One and Two

Rating	Section One	Section Two
<i>Strength</i>	2(20%)	4(40%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	0(0%)	4(40%)
Not Applicable	8(80%)	2(20%)
Total	10(100%)	10(100%)
% Strengths	100%	50%

In Section Two, four of the cases reviewed were rated *strengths* because all of the licensing requirements were met prior to

authorization of the license renewal. Issues identified in Section Two that led to the rating of *ANI* for four cases include:

- In all four cases, several of the safety background checks were not conducted or were not in the file for alternate caregivers or the adopted child living in the home including SLED, FBI, Central Registry, and sexual offender checks.
- In one case, the fire drill date was not recorded for the October 2010 and July 2011 quarterly visit.
- In one case, there was no documentation as to where the firearms are located. However, the quarterly visit guide had the box checked yes that firearms are kept in the home and are appropriately secured.
- There were no medical records in the file for the adopted child that lives in the home.
- There were no medical records in the file for the foster mother’s grandson.
- In one case, the discipline agreement was not signed.

Section Three results are displayed in Table 10. Deficiencies were noted in six of the ten files reviewed. Deficiencies noted in Section Three may not invalidate the license, but still require attention and correction by county management.

Table 10. Section 3: Other Standard Licensing and Practice Issues

	Yes	No	NA	Total
A. Home visits documented in CAPSS?	9	0	1	10
A.1. Adult household members visited?	7	2	1	10
B. CAPSS consistent with 1513?	10	0	0	10
C. Licensing issues addressed during each quarterly visit documented in CAPSS?	9	1	0	10
D. Supervisory Review conducted	9	1	0	10
E. Discussion of safety guidelines regarding access to in-ground swimming pools documented in CAPSS?	0	0	10	10
F. Background checks completed on alternative caregivers?	3	2	5	10

Several issues were identified by the reviewers, including:

- Background safety checks were not completed on all alternative caregivers.
- Sex offender checks were not completed on two foster children living in the home who are ages 14 and 15.
- Some documents are filed in the wrong sections. Fire inspections were scattered throughout the background check information.

- In one case, there were only three quarterly home visits completed during the PUR. There was no documentation in CAPSS to support that the other visits occurred.
- The foster father was not seen during the quarterly visits conducted on 12-14-11, 3-1-12 and 6-20-12.
- One reviewer noted evidence of good supervisory oversight with regular staffings held.

SECTION III: CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICE SCREEN-OUT REVIEW

A review of ten screened-out allegations was completed to determine whether the reports were appropriately screened out. The reports were randomly selected from the list of reports screened out by the county during the period under review. The *Screened-Out CPS Referral Review Instrument* was used to conduct the review. This instrument includes a description of the allegation and three questions:

- In the first question, the reviewer rates the appropriateness of the screen-out using a rating of *yes, no, or cannot determine*.
- In the second question, the reviewer considers whether the necessary collaterals were contacted using a rating of *yes, no, or not applicable*.
- In the third question, the reviewer considers whether appropriate referrals were made using a rating of *yes, no, or not applicable*.

Yes answers are considered *strengths*, no answers are considered *area needing improvement (ANI)*, and N/A answers are considered Not Applicable.

The percentage of *strengths* is also calculated for each question. This percentage is calculated by adding the number of *strengths* and the number of *ANIs*. The number of *strengths* is divided into this total to determine the percentage of *strengths*. Findings of these reviews are noted in Table 11.

Table 11. Summary of Ratings for Screen-Outs Review

Rating	Was this case appropriately screened out?	Were necessary collaterals contacted?	Were appropriate referrals made?
<i>Strength</i>	7(70%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	1(10%)	3(30%)	0(0%)
Not Applicable	0(0%)	7(70%)	10(100%)
Cannot Determine	2(20%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
Total	10(100%)	10(100%)	10(100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	87.5%	0%	N/A

Was this case appropriately screened out?

One case was determined to be screened out inappropriately. In this case, the investigator did not consider the history of the alleged perpetrator and the special needs of the child.

In two cases, the reviewer could not determine whether the report was appropriately screened out because appropriate collateral contacts were not made and an inadequate intake assessment was conducted.

Were necessary collaterals contacted?

Necessary collateral contacts were not made or were not documented in all three of the applicable cases reviewed. In all three cases, no collateral contact was made but reviewers believed they should have been made to further clarify the intake decision.

SECTION IV: CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES UNFOUNDED REPORTS REVIEW

Five unfounded reports were reviewed to determine whether the reports were appropriately unfounded. The five unfounded reports were randomly selected from the list of all reports unfounded by the county during the period under review. The review was conducted using the *Child Welfare Services Review Instrument for Unfounded Reports*. This instrument includes a description of the allegation, the risk level assigned to the case at Intake, and three questions:

- In the first question, the reviewer assesses whether the investigation was initiated in a timely manner using a rating of *yes* or *no*.
- In the second question, the reviewer assesses whether an adequate assessment was conducted using a rating of *yes* or *no*.
- In the third question, the reviewer assesses whether the decision to unfound was appropriate using a rating of *yes* or *no*.

Questions rated as Yes on the assessment are considered *strengths* and those rated as No are considered *ANIs*.

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

Table 12. Summary of Ratings for Unfounded Reports Review

Rating	Was the investigation initiated in a timely manner?	Was an adequate assessment conducted?	Was the decision to unfound the case appropriate?
<i>Strength</i>	5(100%)	3(60%)	5(100%)
<i>Area needing improvement</i>	0(00%)	2(40%)	0(00%)
Total	5(100%)	5(100%)	5(100%)
<i>% Strengths</i>	100%	60%	100%

Was the investigation initiated in a timely manner?

Based upon this review process, it was determined that all five cases were initiated in a timely manner. The rating for two of these cases was high indicating the face-to-face meeting should have occurred within two hours. The other three cases were to be initiated within two to twenty-four hours. The actual contact was made within these timeframes.

Was an adequate assessment conducted?

An inadequate assessment was found to have been conducted in two cases. In the first case, the reviewer found the assessment conducted was inadequate to assess safety, risk, and well-being.

In the second case, dictation does not support that a comprehensive assessment of the mother's physical capacity to care for her children was conducted.

Was the decision to unfound the case appropriate?

All five cases were found to have been unfounded appropriately despite the fact that there was an inadequate assessment on two of the cases.