



**Florida Department of Children and Families Case Review May 2015**

**Review Completed by Action for Child Protection**

**State Overview**

**Date: 7/1/2015**

**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.

**Present Danger Assessment**

---

#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Response
1	a.) Did the worker identify present danger at any point in the investigation process?	45	144	2	191
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was there information to indicate present danger in this case?	42	130	19	191

**Data Summary**

- Total of 42 (22%) cases were identified by the review team case information indicated present danger.
- Total of 45 (24%) cases were identified by the worker indicated present danger.
- This resulted in a difference of 2 (1%) cases between the review teams identification of present danger and the worker identification of present danger.
- Total of 19 (10%) 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.

**Strengths**

- In several of the cases the worker detailed the assessment of present danger concisely and clearly articulated their assessment, either for present danger or that present danger did not exist.

Executive Offices:  
925 6<sup>th</sup> Street NW #4  
Albuquerque, NM 87102  
(505) 345-2500

2101 Sardis Rd North, Suite 204  
Charlotte, NC 28227  
(704) 845-2121  
[www.actionchildprotection.org](http://www.actionchildprotection.org)

- In cases where the worker did identify present danger, they were able to provide good detail to support the identification of the danger threat and how the current family condition was immediate, significant and clearly observable.
- The disparity between reviewer identified present danger and worker identified present danger significantly decreased since the November 2014 review.

### **Areas for Consideration**

- In cases where there was a need for additional present danger assessments, either due to subsequent reports or additional contacts, the assessments were often missing.

## Information Collection

---

#	Question	YES, Information is Sufficient	NO, Information is present but not	NO, Information is not present	Response
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	146	35	10	191
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	149	37	5	191
3	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	124	55	10	189
4	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	130	56	4	190
5	e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	127	59	4	190
6	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	151	38	2	191

### Data Summary

- 72% of the cases reviewed were found to have sufficient information collection. This represents an increase in fidelity of 4% from the November 2014 review.

### Strengths

- Information collection for child functioning was found to be consistently high.
- Several cases were found to have sufficient information for all domains.
- Several cases reviewed were found to have adequate and good quality information.

### Areas for Consideration

- Information collection for parenting discipline was consistently the lowest among all the regions.

## Impending Danger Assessment

---

#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	Response
1	a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	45	146	-	191
2	b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	50	107	34	191

### Data Summary

- Total of 50 (26%) cases were identified by the review team as impending danger.
- Total of 45 (24%) cases were identified by the worker as impending danger.
- This resulted in a difference of **2 (1%)** cases between what the review team identified as impending danger and the worker identified as impending danger. This represents an increase in fidelity of 16% since the Fall 2014 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.

### Areas for Consideration

- Often times when the worker identified present and impending danger, the information collection did not support the continued identification of a danger threat.
- 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.

## Safety Decision

---

#	Question	Safe	Safe: Impending Danger Being Managed by Protective Parent/Legal Guardian	Unsafe	Cannot determine	Response
1	a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	141	14	36	-	191
2	b.) Reviewer judgment	105	5	45	36	191

### Data Summary

- For all cases reviewed the reviewers found that *74% of the cases that were identified as safe by the worker were accurate*. This is an increase of 13% in fidelity since the Fall 2014 review.
- In 19% 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 is a decrease of 4% since the Fall 2014 review.
- The review team found that 23.5% of the cases had one or more children that were identified as unsafe. Worker identified children as unsafe in 19% of the cases. This is a difference of 4.5% between the review team and the worker's safety decision. This is a decrease of 3% in reviewer to worker difference since the last review.

### 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.
- In cases involving domestic violence, the assessment of caregiver protective capacities was insufficient to support the safety decision, in particular when no danger threat was identified.

## Safety Planning

---

#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	Response
1	Does the safety planning analysis and justification clearly support the type of safety plan developed.	32	4	-	36

### Data Summary

- A total of 36 cases were reviewed for safety plans. In those cases, 81% were identified as having detail and sufficiency to control for danger threats. This is an increase of 51% since the Fall 2014 review.
- Less than 1% 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 40% since the Fall 2014 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.