

## Addendum to the 2010-2014 Final Report and 2015-2019 CFSP

Item	Requirement	Document Name and Page Location. ACF Question/Comment	SCDSS Information
PI P.8-9	<i>Information on Child Protective Service Workforce:</i> For child protective service personnel responsible for intake, screening, assessment, and investigation of child abuse and neglect reports in the state, report available information or data	Pages 173 – 178. Chart of page 178 (Final Report) shows established caseload/workload standards. (Note: CB has questions about caseload/workload standards for initial assessment/investigation.	In the 2010-2014 CFSP Final Report, the chart on page 178, in <b>Statistical and Supporting Information</b> , and in the 2015-2019 CFSP, <b>Monthly Caseworker Visit Formula Grants and Standards for Caseworker Visits</b> section, the chart on page 177, contain the same information on established caseload/workload standards. There was a miscalculation in the standards submitted in the 2010-2014 CFSP Final Report and the in the 2015-2019 CFSP. The SCDSS has recalculated and is submitting the following adjusted caseload/workload standards as an addendum.

### SCDSS Caseload Standards

Service/Caseload Type	SCDSS Caseload/Workload Standards	Maximum Percentage/Number of Caseload
Initial Assessment/ Investigation	24 children per Human Services Practitioner	Not exceed 48 children
Ongoing Cases (In-Home)	24 children per Human Services Practitioner	Not exceed 48 children
Foster Family Care	20 children per Human Services Practitioner	Not exceed 40 children

PI P. 9-10	<p><i>Sources of Data on Child Maltreatment Deaths:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe all sources of information relating to child maltreatment fatalities that the state agency currently uses to report data to NCANDS;</li> </ul>	Pages 178 – 179. Data sources do include CAPPS (State SACWIS), coroner/medical examiner, law enforcement, Bureau of Vital Statistics.	The SCDSS Child Fatality Protocol process provides for the reporting of child deaths due to suspected abuse or neglect to the state office of DSS, and for analysis of the SCDSS' activities in cases in which certain children known to the SCDSS' child welfare services who have died. The child deaths to be reviewed fall into two categories: The categories overlap to some degree: (1) deaths due to suspected abuse or neglect, whether or not the child was previously known to the SCDSS, and (2) deaths of children known to the SCDSS, whatever the cause. Deaths in the second category are reviewed through the SCDSS child fatality process. Deaths in the first category are not automatically
------------------	--	---	---

		<p>reviewed, but are reported to the state office of the SCDSS.</p> <p>For the purpose of this protocol, “a child known to the SCDSS” is a child in the custody of the Department at the time of death; a child or child’s family who was receiving protective services as defined by the statute at the time of death or within six months of the death; or a child about whom or a child in a family about whom the Department has received a report of suspected abuse or neglect (including screened out reports) within six months of the child’s death.</p> <p>Reports of the death of a child known to the SCDSS receive a full review if law enforcement, the coroner and/or the local SCDSS office suspect that the death was caused by abuse or neglect. Reports of the death of a child known to the SCDSS receive a summary review when the circumstances suggest that the child’s death was accidental or due to natural causes. “Special Review” is the term used for requests to review cases of death to a child who is not a child “known to the SCDSS” as defined above or (2) death to a child that, without the request for a special review, would have received a summary review. A “Special Review” is also used for requests to review cases of serious injury to a child, if law enforcement and/or the local SCDSS office suspect that the injury was caused by abuse and neglect. Cases designated as “Special Review” will receive the protocol review.</p> <p>At present, the protocol process does not require counties to report serious injuries. However, a few serious injury cases have been reviewed through this process at the request of State Office Executive Staff. Presently, any serious injury cases reviewed under this process are considered to be “Special Review” cases. The SCDSS is currently considering some revisions to the present protocol process, to potentially address the reporting of serious injuries if they fall into the definition categories above. In addition, it will also possibly include a child whose family was referred by the SCDSS for Voluntary Community-Based Prevention Services within six months of the child’s death, as a part of the definition of a child or family “known to the Agency”.</p> <p>The purpose of reviewing deaths of children known to the SCDSS is to have a candid, systematic and confidential analysis of these</p>
--	--	--

			<p>cases, to give the SCDSS administrators information to strengthen and improve child welfare services to the children and families of this state. A summary review is completed when a child in the custody of the SCDSS or in an open treatment case dies of medical reasons. A full review is conducted when the child's death is believed to be the result of child abuse or neglect.</p> <p>The Office of General Counsel (OGC) is responsible for managing the internal review process. The OGC attorney directs the work of a team of investigators and policy experts who gather information, interview witnesses and provide technical analysis.  <b>(In the 2010-2014 CFSP Final Report, replaces 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph under Sources of Information on Child Maltreatment Deaths beginning on page 178 and ending on page 179 to the remaining three sentences before: Table 42. SCDSS-Involved Child Fatalities on page 179).</b></p>
PI P.18	<p>Indicate the specific percentages of title IV-B, subpart 2, funds the state will expend on actual service delivery of family preservation, community-based family support, time-limited family reunification and adoption promotion and support services, and on planning and service coordination, with a rationale for the decision. The state must provide an especially strong rationale if the percentage provided for any one of the four service categories is below 20 percent. The amount allocated to each of the service categories should include only funds for service delivery. Report separately the amount to be allocated to planning and service coordination. Provide the estimated expenditures for the described services on the CFS-101.</p>	<p>Family preservation: 24.99% p. 133  Family support: 27.29% p. 136  Family reunification: 15% p. 138  Adoption: 23.9% p. 139</p> <p>No rationale provided for spending less than 20% on family reunification. Rationale provided for the State's increase in this area since the last APSR was submitted, but need a rationale for why it is still below 20%. State's data shows improvements in meeting timely family reunification.</p>	<p>The SCDSS acknowledges that the aforementioned priorities in Family Preservation and Adoption and Promotion Services have impacted the allocation of PSSF funding to below 20% for Time-Limited Family Reunification.</p> <p>To that end, the SCDSS is increasing its PSSF allocation of funding in Program Area #3, Time-Limited Family Reunification, to 15% for the 2015 FFY, to fund a new service, Family Care Centers, as described on page 139 in the 2015-2019 CFSP. The SCDSS plans to increase funding in this category to Family Care Centers in future FFYs, as more Family Care Centers open across the state and become operationally sustainable and able to optimize PSSF funding.</p>
PI P.34	<p><b>Payment Limitation: Title IV-B, Subpart 2:</b> States are required to spend a significant portion of their title IV-B, subpart 2 PSSF grant for each of the four service categories of PSSF: family preservation, community-based family support, time-limited family reunification, and adoption promotion and support services. For each service category with a percentage of funds that does not approximate 20 percent of the grant total, the State must provide in the narrative portion of the APSR a rationale for</p>	<p>See prior comments on need for rationale.</p>	

	the disproportion.		
PI P.18	Explain how agencies and organizations were selected for funding to provide family support services and how these agencies are community-based.	Pages 136 – 138. Note: could use more clarity on how they are community based.	<p>For example, the Children’s Trust of SC (CTSC) conducts child abuse awareness presentations and events in communities across the state. These include, but are not limited to, “Beaufort’s Kid’s Fest”, “Kids Day” in Lexington, “Kids Fest” with Safe Kids in Sumter, “Lancaster Spring Fest”, and the “Share the Light” event in Charleston. The CTSC also placed Pinwheel Gardens across the state at businesses, schools, daycares, etc. The CTSC sponsors Parent Cafes that are hosted by community organizations throughout the state that support families in abuse prevention.</p> <p>Other community-based organizations, such as Parents Anonymous (FamilyCorps), conduct adult and youth mutual support groups across the state in community centers, elementary schools, libraries, churches, etc. The FamilyCorps conducts sixty-four adult and youth mutual support groups. The Epworth Children’s Home Family Care Center offers cottages on a campus setting within the community. This allows the opportunity for children and their mothers to work on reunification while the mothers receive outpatient, community-based alcohol and drug treatment, and to continue their employment if available.</p>
PI P.24	Describe how the state designed, intends to deliver, and strengthen programs to achieve the purposes of the CFCIP over the next five years.	Pages 157 – 163. Note: State voluntarily participated in NYTD review in July 2014. Awaiting report from CB, then CB to do follow-up with State on setting improvements.	The SCDSS Independent Living staff developed an initial response to the comments from the ACF following the NYTD Review in July 2014. This plan is attached, “CFSP 2015-19 Amended Chafee-IL Goals-Objectives 8-25-14 Addendum.” The state had not yet received the official NYTD response as of the e-mailing of this Addendum to the 2015-2019 CFSP.
PI P.24	Provide relevant data from NYTD or other sources that addresses how services vary by region or county.	Not included. Does State have this information?	<p>See chart below, “NYTD Services Delivered During SFY 2014 To Youth Ages 13 and Older Who Were Receiving Foster Care and/or Aftercare Services”.</p> <p>CAPSS reports are available to analyze funded and unfunded NYTD services provided to youth per South Carolina Region. Report information is collected from the CAPSS case file on the “NYTD Services” tab. As the NYTD Assessment Review Team discovered in the July 2014 voluntary review, documentation of these services is inconsistent and at times unreliable; however</p>

			<p>efforts are being made for the more reliable collection of all NYTD services, funded and unfunded. In addition to the CAPSS data, the Independent Living Program utilizes MS Excel to process funded NYTD services, from which reports can be created as well.</p> <p>The following charts show the data from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014, for funded and unfunded NYTD services by Region.</p>
--	--	--	---

### NYTD Services Delivered During SFY2014

*SCDSS - Division of Accountability, Data, and Research (data from CAPSS on September 1, 2014)*

Region	Case Management Office	Total Clients Receiving Services	Total Services Received	Academic Support	Budget and Financial Management	Career Preparation	Education Financial Assistance	Employment Programs or Vocational Training	Family Support and Healthy Marriage Education	Health Education and Risk Prevention	Housing Education and Home Management Training	Independent Living Needs Assessment	Mentoring	Other Financial Assistance	Post-Secondary Educational Support	Room and Board Financial Assistance	Supervised Independent Living
Region 1 Total		561	8,027	1,778	701	555	104	357	449	1,067	1,712	378	444	178	186	24	94
Region 2 Total		521	3,877	890	129	261	57	254	282	272	804	91	459	83	188	11	96
Region 3 Total		377	3,745	1,125	357	249	28	153	137	419	303	421	367	37	123	6	20
Region 4 Total		361	3,658	1,009	261	278	92	214	129	418	460	120	180	218	230	13	36
Region 5 Total		245	2,829	638	194	228	22	189	160	393	257	228	162	20	147	100	91

PI P.25	For states that extended or plan to extend title IV-E foster care assistance to young people ages 18 – 21, address how implementation of this program option has changed or will change the way in which CFCIP services are targeted to support the transition to self-sufficiency (including changes in the degree to which CFCIP funds are used for room and board). If the state extended title IV-E foster care assistance over age 18, the state must provide available data on participation and discuss how it affects or may drive continuous quality improvement in the delivery of CFCIP services.	Not provided.	South Carolina has not extended, and there are no plans to extend, Title IV-E Foster Care Assistance to young adults ages 18 – 21.
PI P.25	Discuss efforts to coordinate the state’s CFCIP with “other federal and state programs for youth (especially transitional living programs funded under Part B of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974), abstinence programs, local housing programs, programs for disabled youth (especially sheltered workshops), and school-to-work programs offered by high schools or local workforce agencies” in accordance with section 477(b)(3)(F) of the Act. This discussion should include plans to continue to coordinate services with youth shelters and other programs serving youth/ young adults at-risk of homelessness.	Page 170. Note: No information provided on youth shelters or programs for youth at risk of homelessness.	<p>The state CFCIP currently provides funding for emergency housing for youth who are at risk of homelessness. As needed, the CFCIP assists Case Managers in the SCDSS County and Regional Offices to provide resources for youth transitioning out of foster care.</p> <p>Youth who have left foster care and are not yet 21 years old can still request services through their SCDSS County and Regional Offices. Case Managers utilize the SCDSS form 30206, “Providing assistance to transitioning youth program”. This form is used to identify a youth’s needs such as employment services, support, food stamps, child care, Medicaid, and other information needed about community resources.</p> <p>It is the SCDSS policy to not release youth into homelessness from foster care. We do not currently officially partner with local shelters. However, we do provide information to local shelters regarding the services that the Department provides. The SCDSS CFCIP has reached out to local shelters to invite them to partner with the SCDSS through participation on our Independent Living Advisory Board.</p>

PI P.26	Discuss how the child welfare agency collaborated with governmental or other community entities to promote a safe transition to independence by reducing the risk that youth and young adults in the child welfare system will be victims of human trafficking.	Page 170. Noted DSS not directly involved in effort to prevent trafficking in 2010 – 2014 CFSP. What is future role?	The SCDSS is in the early stages of developing a collaborative plan for addressing Human Trafficking in South Carolina. In February, 2014, Agency representatives attended the Children's Bureau Regional Forum in Atlanta, Georgia, on Human Trafficking, in order to learn what other states were providing or exploring related to this issue. Since that time, the SCDSS has interacted with representatives from the FBI, to develop an agreement for placement should that be necessary. The SCDSS was also involved in the planning of the South Carolina Plan to Address Human Trafficking published by the SC Attorney General's Office. The future role of the SCDSS will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- working with the Palmetto Association for Children and Families, to develop a partnership for appropriate placement of children identified as being involved in Human Trafficking;</li> <li>- working with our Project Best partners, to identify appropriate therapeutic resources for children identified as being involved in human trafficking;</li> <li>- providing a more diligent review and oversight of cases in which children have run away from foster care, as a prevention effort to find children at risk for being engaged in human trafficking;</li> <li>- continuing to play a key role in the Statewide Human Trafficking Task Force to develop policy and practice guidelines to prevent and respond to human trafficking.</li> </ul>
PI P.34	<b>Payment Limitation: Title IV-B, Subpart 1:</b> For comparison purposes, submit the amount of title IV-B, subpart 1 funds that the State expended for child care, foster care maintenance and adoption assistance payments in FY 2005.	Region IV fiscal contacted LaTonya Rish about evidence needed for maintenance of effort.	Previously sent by Latonya Rish.
PI P.33	Training Plan... For all types of training include the following information in the training plan: description of estimated total cost; and cost allocation methodology.	Pages 69 – 85. CB will continue to work with State in future to strengthen training plan. Comments: - IV-B application requires description of estimated total training costs and cost allocation methodology. I couldn't find this in the plan.	Per additional guidance from Karla Richardson, the ACF's IV-E Fiscal Specialist for the SCDSS, this report is being developed and the documents will be forthcoming as soon as possible.