



**Florida Department of Children and Families Case Review Fall 2017**

**Review Completed by Action for Child Protection**

**State Overview**

**Date: 01/25/2018**

**Overview and Method**

---

Action for Child Protection, Inc. completed a case record review requested by the Florida Department of Children and Families to assess the implementation of the Florida Safety Methodology. Cases were randomly selected from the six regions in Florida and the sample was provided to Action for Child Protection. Cases were reviewed off-site by Action staff utilizing Qualtrics survey software and FSFN access provided by the Department. This report provides a summary of key findings for the five main focus points of the review: Present Danger, Information Collection, Impending Danger, Safety Determination, and Safety Planning.

An additional data set was reviewed for this review regarding the frequency and quality of the supervisor consultation conducted during the family functioning assessment for CPI and CPIS. This data was requested to assist in the proficiency process for the CPIS and to determine efficacy of the consultation being provided to the CPI during the assessment process.

**Present Danger Assessment**

---

Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total Responses
a.) Did the worker identify present danger at any point in the investigation process?	57	88	0	145
b.) Reviewer judgment: Was there information to indicate present danger in this case?	61	73	11	145

**Data Summary**

- Total of 61 (42%) cases were identified by the review team case information indicated present danger.
- Total of 57 (39%) cases were identified by the worker indicated present danger.


- This resulted in a difference of 4 (3%) cases between the review team identification of present danger and the worker identification of present danger. This represents a slight increase since the June 2017.
- Total of 11 (8%) cases were identified as not having sufficient information either in the case notes or the present danger assessment to determine if present danger was or was not indicated. This is a decrease of 10% for cases where the information in the case record and the PDA were not sufficient to determine the assessment of present danger since the June 2017 review.

### Strengths

- Continues to be a high degree of consistency in the identification of present danger between the reviewers and CPI determinations.
- There was an increase in cases identified as having sufficient information in the case record to determine the assessment of present danger.

### Areas for Consideration

- Reviewers identified present danger in four cases that had not been identified by the caseworker during the case, despite having information to support present danger at the time of the assessment.



## Information Collection

Question	YES, Information is Sufficient	NO, Information is present but not sufficient	NO, Information is not present	Total Responses
Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	106	38	1	145
Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	107	37	1	145
Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	87	55	2	144
Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	72	71	2	145
General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	76	67	2	145
Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	81	59	4	144

## Data Summary

- 50% of the cases reviewed were found to have sufficient information collection in all six information domains. This represents a slight increase in fidelity of 3% from the June 2017 review. This review was conducted utilizing the documentation contained within the Family Functioning Assessment contained in FSN to assess sufficiency of information collection.

## Strengths

- Information collection for maltreatment, extent of maltreatment, and child functioning was found to be consistently high across all regions.
- During this review there was a decrease in cases where there was information represented in the FFA, however was not sufficient

## Areas for Consideration

- Information collection for adult functioning, general parenting, and disciplinary practices were found to be consistently low across all regions.

## Impending Danger Assessment

Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	Total Responses
a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	67	78	0	145
b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	57	60	28	145

## Data Summary

- Total of 57 (39%) cases were identified by the review team as impending danger.
- Total of 67 (46%) cases were identified by the worker as impending danger.
- This resulted in a difference of 10 (7%) cases between what the review team identified as impending danger and the worker identified as impending danger. This data represents that the CPI had identified ten cases where dangers were not supported by the review team.


- There was an decrease in the number of cases during this review where the review team was not able to determine if the decision regarding impending danger was supported, 28 cases (19%). This is a 13% decrease in cases where information is absent to inform the overall safety determination since the June 2017 review.

### Strengths

- Cases where information was determined to be of good quality and sufficient supported the identification of caregiver protective capacities and the danger threats.
- When danger threats were identified, high degree of consistency with review team in the identification of an accurate danger threat(s).

### Areas for Consideration

- Often times when the worker identified present, the information collection did not support the continued identification of an impending danger threat. Focus was on the incident that brought the family to the agency attention, and lack of exploration regarding additional danger threats or accuracy of the danger threat that was identified at present danger at impending danger.
- The assessment of caregiver protective capacities was found to be overly positive or overly negative based upon whether a danger threat was or was not identified.
- The review sample included known cases where impending danger was identified and families were transferred to case management, therefore the sample and review numbers regarding the number of children determined to be unsafe should not be utilized to represent an increase or decrease in case management interventions.



## Safety Decision

---

Question	Safe	Safe: Impending Danger Being Managed by Protective Parent/Legal Guardian	Unsafe	Cannot determine	Total Responses
a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	77	0	67	0	144
b.) Reviewer judgment	59	2	58	24	143

### Data Summary

- For all cases reviewed the reviewers found that 77% of the cases that were identified as safe by the worker were accurate. This is an increase of 17% in fidelity since the June 2017 review.
- For all cases reviewed the reviewers found that 87% of the cases that were identified as unsafe by the worker were accurate. This is an increase of 2% since June 2017, with an over representation of children that were unsafe being made by the CPI.
- The review team found that 41% of the cases had one or more children that were identified as unsafe and the workers identified 47% of the cases as unsafe. This is a difference of 6%.
- Worker identified children as safe in 53% of the cases. This is a difference of 12% between the review team and the worker's safety decision, regarding safe children. This represents a low degree of consistency when children are identified as safe.
- In 17% of the total cases reviewed, the review team was not able to identify if the safety decision (either safe or unsafe) was accurate based upon the information in the case record. This represents an decrease of 17% since the June 2017 review of safety determinations not being able to determined based upon the assessment conducted by the CPI.


### Strengths

- Several cases where information was sufficient, the safety decision was accurate.

### Areas for Consideration

- Several cases did not have sufficient information to determine if the safety decision was accurate, either that the child was or was not safe. Approximately 17% of the cases reviewed did not have information to support the overall safety decision.

# Safety Determination Feb 2016 - Dec 2017



## Safety Planning

Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	Total Responses
Is the safety plan detailed and sufficient level of effort to control for danger threats?	27	30	10	67

## Data Summary

- A total of 67 cases were reviewed for safety plans. In those cases, 40% were identified as having detail and sufficiency to control for danger threats. This represents a decrease of 8% since the June 2017 review.
- 15% of the cases the review team was not able to determine the sufficiency and detail due to either the plan not being developed or the plan lacking information. This is a decrease of 9% since the June 2017 review.

## Strengths

- For the cases where information supported the safety planning analysis and conditions for return, there was evidence of worker engagement and assessment to inform the analysis.

## Areas for Consideration

- The safety planning analysis and conditions for return were not supported by the information in the FFA.
- Conditions for return were often treatment focused and not related to the safety planning analysis.
- Safety planning analysis, on several cases, was based upon the present danger assessment with no indication that further assessment of the home, the parents, or the ability for an in-home safety plan was explored despite the information in the case indicating an in-home plan may have been appropriate.

