



# Child and Family Services Reviews

## South Dakota

## Final Report

## 2016



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
ADMINISTRATION FOR  
**CHILDREN & FAMILIES**  
Administration on Children, Youth and Families  
Children's Bureau

This page is intentionally blank.

## Final Report: South Dakota Child and Family Services Review

### INTRODUCTION

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the state of South Dakota. The CFSRs enable the Children's Bureau to: (1) ensure conformity with certain federal child welfare requirements; (2) determine what is actually happening to children and families as they are engaged in child welfare services; and (3) assist states in enhancing their capacity to help children and families achieve positive outcomes. Federal law and regulations authorize the Children's Bureau, within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families, to administer the review of child and family services programs under titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act. The CFSRs are structured to help states identify strengths and areas needing improvement in their child welfare practices and programs as well as institute systemic changes that will improve child and family outcomes.

The findings for South Dakota are based on:

- The statewide assessment prepared by the South Dakota Department of Social Services (DSS) and submitted to the Children's Bureau on March 25, 2016. The statewide assessment is the state's analysis of its performance on outcomes, and the functioning of systemic factors in relation to title IV-B and IV-E requirements and the title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan
- The results of case reviews of 72 cases (47 foster care and 25 in-home cases) conducted via a State Conducted Case Review process at Mission, Mobridge, Deadwood, Lake Andes, Watertown, Rapid City, and Sioux Falls, South Dakota, between April 1, 2016, and September 30, 2016
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
  - Attorneys representing the agency
  - Attorneys representing children and youth
  - Attorneys representing parents
  - Court Appointed Special Advocates
  - Continuous Quality Improvement staff
  - Child welfare agency directors, senior managers, and program managers
  - Child welfare caseworkers and supervisors
  - Directors from state agencies administering federal programs
  - Foster and adoptive licensing staff
  - Judges

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Training staff
- Tribal judges and representatives
- Parents
- Relative caregivers
- Service providers
- Permanency Planning Review Team (PPRT) members
- Youth served by the agency

In Round 3, the Children's Bureau suspended the use of the state's performance on national standards for the 7 statewide data indicators in conformity decisions. For contextual information, Appendix A of this report shows the state's performance on the 7 data indicators. Moving forward, the Children's Bureau will refer to the national standards as "national performance." This national performance represents the performance of the nation on the statewide data indicators for an earlier point in time. For the time periods used to calculate the national performance for each indicator, see 80 Fed. Reg. 27263 (May 13, 2015).

### Background Information

The Round 3 CFSR assesses state performance with regard to substantial conformity with 7 child and family outcomes and 7 systemic factors. Each outcome incorporates 1 or more of the 18 items included in the case review, and each item is rated as a Strength or Area Needing Improvement based on an evaluation of certain child welfare practices and processes in the cases reviewed in the state. With two exceptions, an item is assigned an overall rating of Strength if 90% or more of the applicable cases reviewed were rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies to those items. For a state to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95% or more of the cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome.

Eighteen items are considered in assessing the state's substantial conformity with the 7 systemic factors. Each item reflects a key federal program requirement relevant to the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) for that systemic factor. An item is rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement based on how well the item-specific requirement is functioning. A determination of the rating is based on information provided by the state to demonstrate the functioning of the systemic factor in the statewide assessment and, as needed, from interviews with stakeholders and partners. For a state to be in substantial conformity with the systemic factors, no more than 1 of the items associated with the systemic factor can be rated as an Area Needing Improvement. For systemic factors that have only 1 item associated with them, that item must be rated as a Strength for a determination of substantial conformity.

The Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round of reviews and in response to feedback from the child welfare field. As such, a state's

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

performance in the third round of the CFSRs is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round. Appendix A provides tables presenting South Dakota's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about South Dakota's performance in Round 2.

### I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

#### South Dakota 2016 CFSR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes and Systemic Factors

None of the 7 outcomes was found to be in substantial conformity.

The following 6 of 7 systemic factors were found to be in substantial conformity:

- Statewide Information System
- Quality Assurance System
- Staff and Provider Training
- Service Array and Resource Development
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community
- Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

#### Children's Bureau Comments on South Dakota Performance

The following are the Children's Bureau's observations about cross-cutting issues and South Dakota's overall performance:

During the CFSR, the Children's Bureau saw that the South Dakota DSS Division of Child Protective Services (CPS) collaborates with internal and external stakeholders in delivering child welfare services. CPS demonstrated ongoing collaborative relationships with key community partners, other federal and state agencies, and Tribal jurisdictions. These agencies work together to provide coordinated services to families involved with the child welfare system, including but not limited to mental health and substance abuse services. CPS will be able to leverage these strong collaborative relationships to successfully complete the Program Improvement Plan (PIP).

Case review results identified concerns with safety and risk assessment and management. These concerns were observed in both foster care and in-home cases; however, achievement of positive outcomes was significantly lower in in-home cases than in foster care cases. CPS's current safety model focuses on assessing only safety and does not include a formalized mechanism for the assessment of risk. Case review results identified a number of key practice concerns, including not assessing the safety and risk of all the children in the family, not assessing the capacity of the safety plan providers before developing and implementing safety

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

plans, inadequate safety plan development and monitoring, and prematurely closing cases when safety concerns remain. The Children's Bureau encourages CPS to examine its current safety practices to be able to accurately assess, identify, and manage safety and risk for all children.

Case review results found that when safety issues are identified, CPS is effective in identifying relatives to participate in safety plans to support families. However, as noted above, there are concerns about the lack of assessment to determine the adequacy or capacity of these relatives to serve as safety plan providers. There are also instances where cases are closed without assuring permanency for the child through a transfer of custody to the relatives. Failure to provide permanency leads to instability and unsafe situations for the children when parents, some who have not participated in services, come back for them.

The Children's Bureau found several practice and systemic issues that negatively affect permanency outcomes. Case review results noted concerns with ensuring appropriate permanency goals for many of the children in foster care and the timely achievement of goals. Petitions to terminate parental rights are not consistently filed in state or Tribal courts. For Native American children, delays in Tribal courts affect the achievement of timely permanency. Stakeholders reported that when a child has a permanency goal of Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement, periodic reviews are not held timely. Often these children are only seen in court annually, which further delays permanency for the child. Stakeholders also reported that although CPS provides notices of hearings to caregivers, state and Tribal courts are generally unaware of the requirement that caregivers have a right to be heard in hearings. The Children's Bureau encourages the state and the courts to focus attention on practices and systems that affect timely and appropriate permanency for all children, including Native American children.

Case review results showed that for many of the cases, CPS assesses the needs of children and parents and provides concrete services to meet the identified needs. However, results showed that worker practice across the state is inconsistent. In some cases, referrals to services are not made timely, and in other cases, workers do not monitor service delivery, which affects the ongoing assessment of the family. There are areas of good practice that result in better outcomes, but there are also instances when infrequent and inadequate worker contacts and assessments lead to poorer outcomes. Failure to assess and engage non-custodial parents, usually fathers, also affected outcomes. South Dakota law prohibits workers from contacting a non-custodial parent if the custodial parent does not want the non-custodial parent contacted, even when the non-custodial parent is involved in the family's life. While this may be appropriate in some cases of extreme domestic or family violence, the law applies to all custodial parents who do not want the non-custodial parent contacted. This negatively affected case ratings for in-home cases when reviewers determined that the non-custodial parent was involved in the children's lives but the agency had not contacted or involved the parent in assessment, case planning, or services because the custodial parent refused to consent. CPS should examine the effect of this law on the agency's practice concerning effectively and appropriately engaging non-custodial parents.

South Dakota is a large and mostly rural state. Stakeholders all reported that issues in accessing the comprehensive array of available services resulting from the state's geography are in part ameliorated by CPS's use of flex funds. Additionally, CPS provides supportive services, including workers and aides providing transportation and gas vouchers to families and providers traveling to meet with families. A service gap identified is the need for more foster homes, especially homes for Native American children. Cases involving Native American children and youth comprised approximately half of the foster care cases reviewed. In many of these cases, the agency did not follow Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) placement preferences, citing a lack of available Native American

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

foster homes. Although the agency is making active efforts to recruit foster homes, the insufficient number and types of foster homes affect the agency's ability to preserve connections, find permanent placements, and ensure stability for children and youth.

South Dakota has a Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) system in place. The state conducts case reviews throughout the year on a sample of cases from each region using the federal CFSR case review instrument. The state uses the review results to determine the current level of practice, strengths, and areas needing improvement, as well as to inform and tailor its recommendations to each of the regions. The Children's Bureau encourages the state to use the CQI process to ensure that practices are consistent across the state offices.

## II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

For each outcome, we provide performance summaries from the case review findings. The CFSR relies upon a case review of an approved sample of foster care cases and in-home services cases. Where relevant, we provide performance summaries that are differentiated between foster care and in-home services cases.

This report provides an overview. Results have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Details on each case rating are available to the South Dakota Department of Social Services. The state is encouraged to conduct additional item-specific analysis of the case review findings to better understand areas of practice that are associated with positive outcomes and those that need improvement.

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

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Item 1.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

South Dakota is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 88% of the 41 applicable cases reviewed.

#### ***Safety Outcome 1 Item Performance***

##### **Item 1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment**

**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(ren) made, within the time frames established by agency policies or state statutes.

State policy requires that for Request for Services (RFS) alleging present danger, face-to-face contact with the alleged child victim is made on the same calendar day the report is received. In RFS alleging impending danger, face-to-face contact with the alleged child victim is within 3 calendar days. The supervisor/screener determines if the time frame for response is the same day as the report is received or within 3 calendar days. If the RFS does not require a present or impending danger response, face-to-face contact with the

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

alleged child victim is made within 7 calendar days. In RFS reports where present or impending danger has been identified but the alleged perpetrator does not have access to the child, face-to-face contact is made within 7 days and before the alleged perpetrator has contact with the child.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 88% of the 41 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the safety statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

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

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 2 and 3.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

South Dakota is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 39% of the 72 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 51% of the 47 foster care cases and 16% of the 25 in-home services cases.

#### **Safety Outcome 2 Item Performance**

##### **Item 2. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-Entry Into Foster Care**

**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.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 83% of the 29 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 92% of the 24 applicable foster care cases and 40% of the 5 applicable in-home services cases.

##### **Item 3. Risk and Safety Assessment and 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.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 40% of the 72 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 51% of the 47 applicable foster care cases and 20% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.

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

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 4, 5, and 6, and on 5 statewide data indicators related to permanency.

#### State Outcome Performance

South Dakota is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 23% of the 47 applicable cases reviewed.

#### Permanency Outcome 1 Item Performance

##### Item 4. Stability of Foster Care Placement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether 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 interests of the child and consistent with achieving the child's permanency goal(s).

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 70% of the 47 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

##### Item 5. Permanency Goal for Child

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

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 60% of the 45 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

##### Item 6. Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, Adoption, or Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether concerted efforts were made, or are being made, during the period under review to achieve reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 30% of the 47 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the permanency statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

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

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

#### State Outcome Performance

South Dakota is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 53% of the 47 applicable cases reviewed.

#### *Permanency Outcome 2 Item Performance*

##### Item 7. Placement With Siblings

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, 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.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 7 because 70% of the 33 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

##### Item 8. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, 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,<sup>1</sup> and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child's relationship with these close family members.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 58% of the 43 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 63% of the 19 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation with a sibling(s) in foster care who is/was in a different placement setting was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.

<sup>1</sup> For Item 8, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification. The persons identified in these roles for the purposes of the review may include individuals who do not meet the legal definitions or conventional meanings of a mother and father.

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

- In 68% of the 34 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her mother was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 45% of the 22 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her father was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.

### Item 9. 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.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 62% of the 47 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 10. 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.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 67% of the 46 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 11. 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<sup>2</sup> or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 59% of the 34 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 66% of the 32 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her mother.
- In 57% of the 21 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her father.

<sup>2</sup> For Item 11, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification.

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

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

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 12, 13, 14, and 15.

#### State Outcome Performance

South Dakota is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 35% of the 72 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 45% of the 47 foster care cases and 16% of the 25 in-home services cases.

#### Well-Being Outcome 1 Item Performance

##### Item 12. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency (1) made concerted efforts to assess the needs of children, parents,<sup>3</sup> and foster parents (both initially, if the child entered foster care or the case was opened during the period under review, and 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 (2) provided the appropriate services.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 36% of the 72 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 45% of the 47 foster care cases and 20% of the 25 in-home services cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

##### Sub-Item 12A. Needs Assessment and Services to Children

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 75% of the 72 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 85% of the 47 foster care cases and 56% of the 25 in-home services cases.

---

<sup>3</sup> For Sub-Item 12B, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable "mothers" and "fathers" for the period under review in the case.

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

### Sub-Item 12B. Needs Assessment and Services to Parents

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 35% of the 63 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 38% of the 39 applicable foster care cases and 29% of the 24 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 64% of the 58 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 42% of the 55 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of fathers.

### Sub-Item 12C. Needs Assessment and Services to Foster Parents

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Strength for Item 12C because 96% of the 45 applicable foster care cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 13. Child and 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<sup>4</sup> and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 51% of the 70 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 65% of the 46 applicable foster care cases and 25% of the 24 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 76% of the 41 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 67% of the 58 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 54% of the 54 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve fathers in case planning.

---

<sup>4</sup> For Item 13, in the in-home cases, “Mother” and “Father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, “mother” and “father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency’s work with multiple applicable “mothers” and “fathers” for the period under review in the case.

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

### Item 14. Caseworker Visits With 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(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 85% of the 72 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 94% of the 47 foster care cases and 68% of the 25 in-home services cases.

### Item 15. 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<sup>5</sup> of the child(ren) are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 34% of the 64 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 41% of the 39 applicable foster care cases and 24% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 60% of the 60 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 33% of the 54 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with fathers were sufficient.

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

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Item 16.

### State Outcome Performance

South Dakota is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2.

---

<sup>5</sup> For Item 15, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" is typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable mother and fathers for the period under review in the case.

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

The outcome was substantially achieved in 90% of the 48 applicable cases reviewed.

### ***Well-Being Outcome 2 Item Performance***

#### **Item 16. Educational Needs of the 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.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 90% of the 48 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 93% of the 41 applicable foster care cases and 71% of the 7 applicable in-home services cases.

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

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 3 using the state's performance on Items 17 and 18.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

South Dakota is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 3.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 63% of the 64 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 62% of the 47 applicable foster care cases and 65% of the applicable 17 in-home services cases.

### ***Well-Being Outcome 3 Item Performance***

#### **Item 17. Physical Health of the Child**

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

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 76% of the 58 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 79% of the 47 foster care cases and 64% of the 11 applicable in-home services cases.

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

### Item 18. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the children.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 66% of the 38 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 63% of the 27 applicable foster care cases and 73% of the 11 applicable in-home services cases.

## III. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS

For each systemic factor below, we provide performance summaries and a determination of whether the state is in substantial conformity with that systemic factor. In addition, we provide ratings for each item and a description of how the rating was determined. The CFSR relies upon a review of information contained in the statewide assessment to assess each item. If an item rating cannot be determined from the information contained in the statewide assessment, the Children's Bureau conducts stakeholder interviews and considers information gathered through the interviews in determining ratings for each item.

### Statewide Information System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 19.

#### **State Systemic Factor Performance**

South Dakota is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

#### ***Statewide Information System Item Performance***

### Item 19. Statewide Information System

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The statewide information system is functioning statewide to ensure that, at a minimum, the state can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child who is (or, within the immediately preceding 12 months, has been) in foster care.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Strength for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that South Dakota's statewide information system functions statewide to ensure that the state can identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for placement of children who are in foster care.

### Case Review System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

South Dakota is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. One of the 5 items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

#### Case Review System Item Performance

##### Item 20. Written Case Plan

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a written case plan that is developed jointly with the child's parent(s) and includes the required provisions.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment. South Dakota agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- In the statewide assessment, South Dakota reported that parent and child participation in the development of case plans is not evident. South Dakota is in the process of revising the case plan and compliance report.

##### Item 21. Periodic Reviews

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that a periodic review for each child occurs no less frequently than once every 6 months, either by a court or by administrative review.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders indicated that in South Dakota, periodic reviews occur by courts and by administrative review. Administrative reviews are conducted by the Permanency Planning Review Team (PPRT). In one large region of the state, the PPRT conducts all periodic reviews, while in other regions, the PPRT conducts the review only in those cases where the courts do not. Stakeholders reported that court periodic reviews are timely. However, because the process for scheduling a PPRT when the court does have a periodic review is

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

unclear, it is uncertain whether periodic reviews conducted by PPRTs are occurring timely. Stakeholders also said that periodic reviews do not occur timely for children who have the goal of other planned permanent living arrangement.

### Item 22. Permanency Hearings

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a permanency hearing in a qualified court or administrative body that occurs no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that permanency hearings are happening regularly for children in state court. Tribal judges reported that generally they do not have a consistent, formalized process for scheduling permanency hearings and that permanency hearings do not occur timely for children in Tribal courts.

### Item 23. Termination of Parental Rights

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that the filing of termination of parental rights proceedings occurs in accordance with required provisions.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders indicated that there is not a consistent statewide process for filling termination of parental rights (TPR) petitions. South Dakota provided data showing that timely filings of TPR petitions did not occur in several cases. Stakeholders said that termination proceedings do not occur timely for Native American children.

### Item 24. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning to ensure that foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care are notified of, and have a right to be heard in, any review or hearing held with respect to the child.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Strength for Item 24. Findings were determined based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that there is a process in place to notify foster parents, adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of reviews and hearings. Written notices are provided to caregivers. The written notice informs caregivers of their right to be heard in any review or hearing.

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

### Quality Assurance System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 25.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

South Dakota is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

#### Quality Assurance System Item Performance

##### Item 25. Quality Assurance System

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The quality assurance system is functioning statewide to ensure that it (1) operating in the jurisdictions where the services included in the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) are provided, (2) has standards to evaluate the quality of services (including standards to ensure that children in foster care are provided quality services that protect their health and safety), (3) identifies strengths and needs of the service delivery system, (4) provides relevant reports, and (5) evaluates implemented program improvement measures.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Strength for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, South Dakota provided sufficient information to show that the quality assurance system is functioning in the jurisdiction where the services included in the CFSP are provided. The state conducts quality assurance reviews and uses reports from its Statewide Automated Child Welfare System (SACWIS) to evaluate the process. Reports are accessible to all staff and the state then uses the reports and case review results to implement improvements and monitor progress.

### Staff and Provider Training

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 26, 27, and 28.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

South Dakota is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Staff and Provider Training. Three of the items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

#### Staff and Provider Training Item Performance

##### Item 26. Initial Staff Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that initial training is provided to all staff who deliver services pursuant to the CFSP that includes the basic skills and knowledge required for their positions.

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Strength for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected from stakeholders showed that the staff and provider training system functions statewide to ensure that initial training is provided to all staff consistently and that staff do not have caseworker responsibilities until after successful completion of the Foundational Certification Training. Training is designed to ensure that each staff person obtains the basic skills and knowledge needed to complete their duties.

### Item 27. Ongoing Staff Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that ongoing training is provided for staff<sup>6</sup> that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Strength for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, the state illustrated that the staff and provider training system is functioning well to ensure that staff and supervisors are provided with required training to successfully complete ongoing job requirements.

### Item 28. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that training is occurring statewide for current or prospective foster parents, adoptive parents, and staff of state licensed or approved facilities (that care for children receiving foster care or adoption assistance under title IV-E) that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to foster and adopted children.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Strength for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information from the statewide assessment and collected from stakeholders showed that the state provides training to all foster parents on an initial and ongoing basis, and has data to support this. There is a process to train child care institution staff initially and on an ongoing basis, and this information is tracked through the use of a statewide database. A state review indicated compliance with training requirements for all foster homes and staff personnel records from child care institutions.

---

<sup>6</sup> "Staff," for purposes of assessing this item, includes all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP. "Staff" also includes direct supervisors of all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP.

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

### Service Array and Resource Development

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 29 and 30.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

South Dakota is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Service Array and Resource Development. One of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

#### *Service Array and Resource Development Item Performance*

##### Item 29. Array of Services

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The service array and resource development system is functioning to ensure that the following array of services is accessible in all political jurisdictions covered by the CFSP: (1) services that assess the strengths and needs of children and families and determine other service needs, (2) services that address the needs of families in addition to individual children in order to create a safe home environment, (3) services that enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable, and (4) services that help children in foster and adoptive placements achieve permanency.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 29 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information from the statewide assessment indicated that although there is an adequate array of services in all jurisdictions of the state, families who live in the less populated areas of the state must drive farther to access services and experience waitlists for some needed services. In addition, stakeholders noted that there are not enough Native American foster homes for Native American children.

##### Item 30. Individualizing Services

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The service array and resource development system is functioning statewide to ensure that the services in Item 29 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children and families served by the agency.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Strength for Item 30 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during stakeholder interviews indicated that services are individualized to meet the needs to children and families and are culturally competent. Stakeholders also noted that flexible funding is available and is used to ensure that a tailored set of services are provided to families.

### Agency Responsiveness to the Community

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 31 and 32.

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

### State Systemic Factor Performance

South Dakota is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. Both of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

### *Agency Responsiveness to the Community Item Performance*

#### Item 31. State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that, in implementing the provisions of the CFSP and developing related Annual Progress and Services Reports (APSRs), the state engages in ongoing consultation with Tribal representatives, consumers, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies and includes the major concerns of these representatives in the goals, objectives, and annual updates of the CFSP.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, the state showed that stakeholders are routinely involved in the development of the CFSP and APSR. The state engages in ongoing consultation with Tribal representatives, children and families, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies. Concerns of these representatives are included in the goals, objectives, and annual updates of the CFSP.

#### Item 32. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state's services under the CFSP are coordinated with services or benefits of other federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, the state provided information that addressed how services under the CFSP are coordinated with services or benefits with other federal programs serving the same population. Stakeholders gave examples of how services are coordinated across programs. Stakeholders suggested that the state could focus more statewide coordination efforts with Housing and Urban Development (HUD), given that housing was identified as a service with significant access issues. Stakeholders reported coordination of HUD services at the local level; however, there is an opportunity for the state to coordinate additional HUD services at the state level.

### Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 33, 34, 35, and 36.

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

### State Systemic Factor Performance

South Dakota is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. Three of the four items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

### *Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention Item Performance*

#### Item 33. Standards Applied Equally

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that state standards are applied to all licensed or approved foster family homes or child care institutions receiving title IV-B or IV-E funds.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Strength for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected from stakeholders showed that the state has processes in place to equally apply licensing standards to all licensed foster and adoptive homes and licensed child care institutions.

#### Item 34. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state complies with federal requirements for criminal background clearances as related to licensing or approving foster care and adoptive placements and has in place a case planning process that includes provisions for addressing the safety of foster care and adoptive placements for children.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Strength for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews showed that the state is complying with federal requirements for criminal background clearances related to licensing foster care and adoptive placements. The state has a process in place for addressing safety concerns identified for children in foster and adoptive placements.

#### Item 35. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families who reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the state for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed is occurring statewide.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Strength for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.

## South Dakota 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Information from the statewide assessment and collected from stakeholders demonstrated that the state's process for ensuring diligent recruitment is functioning statewide. The recruitment of foster and adoptive homes for children is reflective of the population.

### **Item 36. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the effective use of cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate timely adoptive or permanent placements for waiting children is occurring statewide.

- South Dakota received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment. South Dakota agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that the state does not complete Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) requests timely. The state makes good use of cross-jurisdiction resources for placement.

**Appendix A: Summary of South Dakota 2016 CFSR Performance**

**Appendix A  
Summary of South Dakota 2016 Child and Family Services Review Performance**

**I. Ratings for Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being Outcomes and Items**

**Outcome Achievement:** Outcomes may be rated as in substantial conformity or not in substantial conformity. 95% of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the state to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

**Item Achievement:** Items may be rated as a Strength or as an Area Needing Improvement. For an overall rating of Strength, 90% of the cases reviewed for the item (with the exception of Item 1 and Item 16) must be rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies.

**SAFETY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN ARE, FIRST AND FOREMOST, PROTECTED FROM ABUSE AND NEGLECT.**

<b>Data Element</b>	<b>Overall Determination</b>	<b>State Performance</b>
<b>Safety Outcome 1</b> Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	Not in Substantial Conformity	88% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 1</b> Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	88% Strength

**SAFETY OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN ARE SAFELY MAINTAINED IN THEIR HOMES WHENEVER POSSIBLE AND APPROPRIATE.**

<b>Data Element</b>	<b>Overall Determination</b>	<b>State Performance</b>
<b>Safety Outcome 2</b> Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate	Not in Substantial Conformity	39% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 2</b> Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Area Needing Improvement	83% Strength
<b>Item 3</b> Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	40% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of South Dakota 2016 CFSR Performance

### PERMANENCY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN HAVE PERMANENCY AND STABILITY IN THEIR LIVING SITUATIONS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Permanency Outcome 1</b> Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	Not in Substantial Conformity	23% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 4</b> Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	70% Strength
<b>Item 5</b> Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	60% Strength
<b>Item 6</b> Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	30% Strength

### PERMANENCY OUTCOME 2: THE CONTINUITY OF FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND CONNECTIONS IS PRESERVED FOR CHILDREN.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Permanency Outcome 2</b> The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children	Not in Substantial Conformity	53% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 7</b> Placement with siblings	Area Needing Improvement	70% Strength
<b>Item 8</b> Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	58% Strength
<b>Item 9</b> Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	62% Strength
<b>Item 10</b> Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	67% Strength
<b>Item 11</b> Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	59% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of South Dakota 2016 CFSR Performance

### WELL-BEING OUTCOME 1: FAMILIES HAVE ENHANCED CAPACITY TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN'S NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 1</b> Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	35% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 12</b> Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	36% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12A</b> Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	75% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12B</b> Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	35% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12C</b> Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Strength	96% Strength
<b>Item 13</b> Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	51% Strength
<b>Item 14</b> Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	85% Strength
<b>Item 15</b> Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	34% Strength

### WELL-BEING OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 2</b> Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	90% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 16</b> Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	90% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of South Dakota 2016 CFSR Performance

### WELL-BEING OUTCOME 3: CHILDREN RECEIVE ADEQUATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 3</b> Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	63% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 17</b> Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	76% Strength
<b>Item 18</b> Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	66% Strength

## II. Ratings for Systemic Factors

The Children’s Bureau determines whether a state is in substantial conformity with federal requirements for the 7 systemic factors based on the level of functioning of each systemic factor across the state. The Children’s Bureau determines substantial conformity with the systemic factors based on ratings for the item or items within each factor. Performance on 5 of the 7 systemic factors is determined on the basis of ratings for multiple items or plan requirements. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with these systemic factors, the Children’s Bureau must find that no more than 1 of the required items for that systemic factor fails to function as required. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with the 2 systemic factors that are determined based on the rating of a single item, the Children’s Bureau must find that the item is functioning as required.

### STATEWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Statewide Information System</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	In Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 19</b> Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of South Dakota 2016 CFSR Performance

### CASE REVIEW SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Case Review System</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 20</b> Written Case Plan	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 21</b> Periodic Reviews	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 22</b> Permanency Hearings	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 23</b> Termination of Parental Rights	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 24</b> Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

### QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Quality Assurance System</b>	Statewide Assessment	In Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 25</b> Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment	Strength

### STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Staff and Provider Training</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	In Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 26</b> Initial Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of South Dakota 2016 CFSR Performance

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Item 27</b> Ongoing Staff Training	Statewide Assessment	Strength
<b>Item 28</b> Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

### SERVICE ARRAY AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Service Array and Resource Development</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	In Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 29</b> Array of Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 30</b> Individualizing Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

### AGENCY RESPONSIVENESS TO THE COMMUNITY

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Agency Responsiveness to the Community</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	In Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 31</b> State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR	Statewide Assessment	Strength
<b>Item 32</b> Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of South Dakota 2016 CFSR Performance

### FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE PARENT LICENSING, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	In Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 33</b> Standards Applied Equally	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 34</b> Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 35</b> Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 36</b> State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement

### III. Performance on Statewide Data Indicators<sup>7</sup>

The state's performance is considered against the national performance for each statewide data indicator and provides contextual information for considering the findings. This information is not used in conformity decisions. State performance may be statistically above, below, or no different than the national performance. If a state did not provide the required data or did not meet the applicable item data quality limits, the Children's Bureau did not calculate the state's performance for the statewide data indicator.

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Recurrence of maltreatment	9.1%	Lower	7.0%	5.4%–8.9%	FY13–14
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	8.50	Lower	2.95	1.66–5.24	14A–14B, FY14

<sup>7</sup> In October 2016, the Children's Bureau issued Technical Bulletin #9 (<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/cfsr-technical-bulletin-9>), which alerted states to the fact that there were technical errors in the syntax used to calculate the national and state performance for the statewide data indicators. The syntax revision is still underway, so performance shown in this table is based on the 2015 Federal Register syntax.

## Appendix A: Summary of South Dakota 2016 CFSR Performance

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	40.5%	Higher	41.6%	38.7%–44.5%	12B–15A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	43.6%	Higher	40.5%	35.9%–45.1%	14B–15A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	30.3%	Higher	23.9%	20.6%–27.5%	14B–15A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.3%	Lower	8.9%	6.5%–11.9%	12B–15A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.12	Lower	4.61	4.22–5.03	14B–15A

\* **Risk-Standardized Performance (RSP)** is derived from a multi-level statistical model and reflects the state's performance relative to states with similar children and takes into account the number of children the state served, the age distribution of these children, and, for some indicators, the state's entry rate. It uses risk-adjustment to minimize differences in outcomes due to factors over which the state has little control and provides a more fair comparison of state performance against national performance.

\*\* **95% Confidence Interval** is the 95% confidence interval estimate for the state's RSP. The values shown are the lower RSP and upper RSP of the interval estimate. The interval accounts for the amount of uncertainty associated with the RSP. For example, the CB is 95% confident that the true value of the RSP is between the lower and upper limit of the interval.

\*\*\* **Data Period(s) Used for State Performance:** Refers to the initial 12-month period and the period(s) of data needed to follow the children to observe their outcomes. The FY or federal fiscal year refers to NCANDS data, which spans the 12-month period October 1 – September 30. All other periods refer to AFCARS data. "A" refers to the 6-month period October 1 – March 31. "B" refers to the 6-month period April 1 – September 30. The 2-digit year refers to the calendar year in which the period ends.

## Appendix B: South Dakota 2008 CFSR Key Findings

### Appendix B Summary of CFSR Round 2 South Dakota 2008 Key Findings

The Children’s Bureau conducted a CFSR in South Dakota in 2008. Key findings from that review are presented below. Because the Children’s Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round and in response to feedback from the child welfare field, a state’s performance in the third round of the CFSR is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round.

#### Identifying Information and Review Dates

<b>General Information</b>
<b>Children’s Bureau Region:</b> 8
<b>Date of Onsite Review:</b> May 19–23, 2008
<b>Period Under Review:</b> April 1, 2007, through May 23, 2008
<b>Date Courtesy Copy of Final Report Issued:</b> February 26, 2009
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Due:</b> May 27, 2009
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Approved:</b> July 1, 2010

#### Highlights of Findings

<b>Performance Measurements</b>
A. The State met the national standards for <b>three</b> of the <b>six</b> standards.
B. The State achieved substantial conformity with <b>one</b> of the <b>seven</b> outcomes.
C. The State achieved substantial conformity for <b>five</b> of the <b>seven</b> systemic factors.

## Appendix B: South Dakota 2008 CFSR Key Findings

### State's Conformance With the National Standards

Data Indicator or Composite	Standard	State's Score	Meets or Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of maltreatment recurrence (data indicator)	94.6 or higher	94.7	Meets Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	100.0	Meets Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	138.3	Meets Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	55.4	Does Not Meet Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	64.1	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	79.9	Does Not Meet Standard

### State's Conformance With the Outcomes

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

## Appendix B: South Dakota 2008 CFSR Key Findings

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

### State's Conformance With the Systemic Factors

Systemic Factor	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Statewide Information System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Case Review System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Quality Assurance System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Staff and Provider Training	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Service Array and Resource Development	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Achieved Substantial Conformity

## Appendix B: South Dakota 2008 CFSR Key Findings

### Key Findings by Item

#### Outcomes

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment	Strength
Item 2. Repeat Maltreatment	Area Needing Improvement
Item 3. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-entry Into Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
Item 4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	Strength
Item 5. Foster Care Re-entries	Strength
Item 6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 7. Permanency Goal for Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Permanent Placement With Relatives	Strength
Item 9. Adoption	Area Needing Improvement
Item 10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	Strength
Item 12. Placement With Siblings	Strength
Item 13. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
Item 14. Preserving Connections	Strength
Item 15. Relative Placement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 16. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
Item 17. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents	Area Needing Improvement

## Appendix B: South Dakota 2008 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	Area Needing Improvement
Item 19. Caseworker Visits With Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 20. Caseworker Visits With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
Item 21. Educational Needs of the Child	Strength
Item 22. Physical Health of the Child	Strength
Item 23. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement

### Systemic Factors

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 24. Statewide Information System	Strength
Item 25. Written Case Plan	Area Needing Improvement
Item 26. Periodic Reviews	Strength
Item 27. Permanency Hearings	Area Needing Improvement
Item 28. Termination of Parental Rights	Area Needing Improvement
Item 29. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Strength
Item 30. Standards Ensuring Quality Services	Strength
Item 31. Quality Assurance System	Area Needing Improvement
Item 32. Initial Staff Training	Strength
Item 33. Ongoing Staff Training	Area Needing Improvement
Item 34. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Strength
Item 35. Array of Services	Strength
Item 36. Service Accessibility	Area Needing Improvement
Item 37. Individualizing Services	Strength
Item 38. Engagement in Consultation With Stakeholders	Strength

## Appendix B: South Dakota 2008 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 39. Agency Annual Reports Pursuant to CFSP	Strength
Item 40. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Strength
Item 41. Standards for Foster Homes and Institutions	Strength
Item 42. Standards Applied Equally	Strength
Item 43. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Strength
Item 44. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Area Needing Improvement
Item 45. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Strength