

Action Child Protection

Florida Department of Children and Families Case Review

Review Completed by Action for Child Protection

Date: January 10, 2019



TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEWIDE	#
<u>OVERVIEW AND METHOD</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>STATE CPI OVERVIEW NARRATIVE REPORT</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>STATE CM OVERVIEW NARRATIVE REPORT</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>STATE DATA OVERVIEW REPORT FOR INTAKE, CPI, AND CASE MANAGEMENT</u>	<u>16</u>
CHILD PROTECTION SUPERVISOR.....	#
<u>SUPERVISOR CPI DATA REPORT.....</u>	<u>65</u>
<u>SUPERVISOR CPI DATA REPORT (SAFE UNABLE TO DETERMINE BY REVIEWER)</u>	<u>70</u>
<u>SUPERVISOR CPI DATA REPORT (SAFE DETERMINATION- REVIEWER AND CPIS).....</u>	<u>78</u>
<u>SUPERVISOR CM DATA REPORT</u>	<u>86</u>
RSF CLOSED CASE REVIEW COMPARISON WITH FIDELITY SAMPLE OUTCOMES	
<u>RSF REVIEW DATA AND FIDELITY REVIEW SAMPLE DATA</u>	<u>88</u>
NORTHWEST REGION	#
<u>NORTHWEST REGION REPORT: CPI AND CM</u>	<u>91</u>
<u>WALTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE.....</u>	<u>137</u>
<u>FAMILIES FIRST NETWORK</u>	<u>157</u>
<u>BIG BEND CBC</u>	<u>184</u>
NORTHEAST REGION.....	#
<u>NORTHEAST REGION REPORT: CPI AND CM</u>	<u>211</u>
<u>FAMILY INTEGRITY PROGRAM</u>	<u>259</u>
<u>COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP FOR CHILDREN.....</u>	<u>276</u>
<u>FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES OF NORTH FLORIDA</u>	<u>293</u>
<u>KIDS FIRST OF FLORIDA INC.</u>	<u>320</u>
<u>PARTNERSHIP FOR STRONG FAMILIES</u>	<u>337</u>
CENTRAL REGION	#
<u>CENTRAL REGION REPORT: CPI AND CM</u>	<u>364</u>
<u>SEMINOLE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE</u>	<u>411</u>
<u>KIDS CENTRAL</u>	<u>428</u>
<u>COMMUNITY BASED CARE OF CENTRAL FLORIDA</u>	<u>445</u>
<u>HEARTLAND FOR CHILDREN</u>	<u>472</u>
<u>BREVARD FAMILY PARTNERSHIP</u>	<u>489</u>
<u>COMMUNITY BASED CARE OF CENTRAL FLORIDA: SEMINOLE COUNTY</u>	<u>506</u>
SUNCOAST REGION	#
<u>SUNCOAST REGION REPORT: CPI AND CM</u>	<u>523</u>
<u>HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE</u>	<u>572</u>
<u>MANATEE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE</u>	<u>593</u>
<u>PASCO COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE</u>	<u>614</u>
<u>PINELLAS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE</u>	<u>635</u>

Action4Child Protection

ECKERD COMMUNITY ALTERNATIVES	656
SARASOTA Y/SAFE FAMILY COALITION	683
CHILDREN'S NETWORK OF SW FLORIDA	700

SOUTHEAST REGION..... #

SOUTHEAST REGION REPORT: CPI AND CM	727
BROWARD COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE	773
CHILD NET PALM BEACH	793
COMMUNITIES CONNECTED FOR KIDS	820

SOUTHERN REGION..... #

SOUTHERN REGION REPORT: CPI AND CM	847
OUR KIDS CBC	896



Overview and Method

Action for Child Protection, Inc. completed a case record review requested by the Florida Department of Children and Families to assess fidelity of practice 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 by the Office of Child Welfare. Case information was reviewed off-site by Action for Child Protection staff utilizing FSFN access provided by the Department. Case review instruments were completed for each case using Qualtrics survey software. Data reports were generated for each of the six regions and corresponding community based care agencies and sheriff's offices providing services within Florida child welfare.

Summary report narratives are provided for the Office of Child Welfare for Intake, Child Protection Investigations and Case Management. Data overview reports are provided for the Office of Child Welfare, each of the six regions, Sheriff's offices, and community based care agencies.

Total Sample Size: 152 Unsafe Cases: 80 Safe Cases: 70

Region	%	Count
Central	16.45%	25
Northwest	18.42%	28
Northeast	16.45%	25
Southern	16.45%	25
Southeast	16.45%	25
Suncoast	15.79%	24
Total	100%	152

Action4 Child Protection

State CPI Overview Narrative Report

This report provides a summary of key findings for the five main child protection investigations focus points of the current review: Present Danger, Information Collection, Impending Danger, Safety Determination, and Safety Planning.

Present Danger Assessment

Question	Yes		No		Cannot Determine		Total
a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	73.68%	112	22.37%	34	3.95%	6	152
b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	45.39%	69	54.61%	83	0.00%	0	152
c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	76.97%	117	9.87%	15	13.16%	20	152

Data Summary


- Total of 69 (45%) cases the CPI had identified present danger during the investigation. When cross tabulating the cases where present danger was identified by the CPI and the reviewer agreement with the present danger decision, agreement was determined to be 84% (n=58) for cases where present danger was identified. However, for overall present danger assessment accuracy, 77% (n=117) were identified as being accurate by the review team. This is a substantial increase from the last review, approximately 43%.
- The review team identified 58 cases where children were in present danger. This is approximately 11 cases less than what was identified by the child protection investigators.
- Total of 6 (4%) cases contained present danger assessments that were not sufficient to support decision making. This is a decrease of 18% since the last review and a 20% decrease in the last year.

Strengths

- Continues to be a high degree of consistency in the identification of present danger between the reviewers and CPI determinations.

Areas for Consideration

- Reviewers identified that in eleven cases where the CPI had identified present danger, present that the present danger determination was not accurate.
- In cases where the CPI had identified present danger and the review team was not in agreement, the present danger assessments(s) were focused on the child victim and the incident that was alleged without regard for the overall family condition.



Information Collection

Question	Yes		No	Total
a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	79.33%	119	20.67%	31 150
b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	74.67%	112	25.33%	38 150
f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	50.34%	75	49.66%	74 149
e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	43.62%	65	56.38%	84 149
d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	40.94%	61	59.06%	88 149
c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	39.60%	59	60.40%	90 149

Data Summary


- 39% of the cases reviewed were found to have sufficient information collection in all six information domains. This represents a slight decrease in fidelity of 11% from the June 2018 review. This review was conducted utilizing the documentation contained within the Family Functioning Assessment contained in FSFN to assess sufficiency of information collection.
- Maltreatment domain remained the same for fidelity from the last review, with 79% of the cases having sufficient information for this domain.
- Nature of maltreatment decreased slightly, 2%. While child functioning, parenting general, and parenting discipline decreased approximately 11% since June 2018.

Strengths

- Information collection for maltreatment, extent of maltreatment, and child functioning was found to be consistently high across all regions.

Areas for Consideration

- Information collection for adult functioning, general parenting, and disciplinary practices were found to be consistently low across all regions.
- Information collection remains to be an area of need. During the last year there has been little progress demonstrated regarding sufficient information collection within the family functioning assessment documentation.
- Upon case review, reviewers noted that the case notes frequently did not contain information that could inform the overall information collection being sufficient during field activities. This results in not only the documentation in the family functioning assessment being insufficient, but the case record to support decision making also being insufficient.



Impending Danger Assessment

Question	Yes		No		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	53.33%	80	46.67%	70	0.00%	0	150
b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	51.33%	77	30.00%	45	18.67%	28	150

Data Summary

- Total of 77 (51%) cases were identified by the review team as impending danger.
- Total of 80 (53%) cases were identified by the worker as impending danger.
- This resulted in a difference of 3 (2%) 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 three cases where dangers were not supported by the review team.

Action 4 Child Protection

- There was no change since the last review for cases where the review team was not able to determine if the decision regarding impending danger was supported, 28 cases (19%).

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). This has been consistent throughout the last four reviews by Action for Child Protection. Agreement with the determination of impending danger remains high representing accuracy in determination of danger for unsafe children.

Areas for Consideration

- Often times when the worker identified present danger, 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		Unsafe		Unable to Determine due to Insufficient Information in Case Record		Total
a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	45.33%	68	54.67%	82	0.00%	0	150
b.) Reviewer judgment	30.72%	47	50.98%	78	18.30%	28	153

Data Summary

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

Action4 Child Protection

- For all cases reviewed the reviewers found that 69% of the cases that were identified as safe by the worker were accurate. This is a decrease of 8% in fidelity since the June 2018 review.
- For all cases reviewed the reviewers found that 95% of the cases that were identified as unsafe by the worker were accurate. This is an increase of 8% since June 2018, with an over representation of children that were unsafe being made by the CPI.
- The review team found that 51% of the cases had one or more children that were identified as unsafe and the workers identified 55% of the cases as unsafe. This is a difference of 4%.
- Worker identified children as safe in 45% of the cases. This is a difference of 14% 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 18% 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 a decrease of 18% since the June 2017 review of safety determinations not being able to be determined based upon the assessment conducted by the CPI.

Strengths

- Several cases where information was sufficient, the safety decision was accurate.
- For cases where children are identified as unsafe, the review team was in agreement with the decision 95% of the time.

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 18% of the cases reviewed did not have information to support the overall safety decision.

Safety Planning

Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services	%	Count
Yes	59.49%	47
No	24.05%	19
Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	16.46%	13
Total	100%	79

Action4 Child Protection

Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented when met	%	Count
Yes	47.62%	30
No	44.44%	28
Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	7.94%	5
Total	100%	63

Data Summary

- A total of 80 cases were reviewed for safety plans. In those cases, 59% were identified as having detail and sufficiency to control for danger threats.
- 16% 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.
- Conditions for return remain inconsistent. 63 cases were identified as having conditions for return due to out of home safety plans. 48% of the cases were noted to have conditions for return that were supported by the safety planning analysis.

Strengths

- For cases where in home safety plans were developed, there was agreement that the plans were supported by the safety planning analysis.
- For 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 frequently not supported by the information in the FFA. This was noted for most of the cases where an out of home safety plan was developed.
- 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.

State Overview for Case Management Narrative Report

This report provides a summary of key findings for the five main case management focus points of the current review: Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment Intervention Stages and Information Collection, Assessing and Scaling Caregiver Protective Capacities and Child Needs, Case Plan Outcomes, Ongoing Safety Management, and Progress Evaluation

Sample Size: 80

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment Intervention Stages and Information Collection

Data Summary

- 55% of the cases indicated that the Case Manager began intervention through active engagement and introduction with the family. This represents a decrease of 15% since the review in June 2018, however an overall increase of 14% in the last year.
- 40% of the cases indicated that the Case Manager was able to obtain additional, sufficient information to inform the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment. This represents a 25% increase since Fall 2017.

Strengths

- There were several cases where the case manager began engagement with the family in a timely manner to support developing rapport and information collection with the family.
- There was an increase in overall information collection contained within the ongoing family functioning assessments over the past year.

Areas for Consideration

- There were some cases where the ongoing family functioning assessment was either exactly the same as the initial family functioning assessment and did not reflect additional information collection with the family, or additional information collection and documentation was still not sufficient.
- In the last year, while noted progress, overall information collection for the ongoing family functioning assessment remains low. Adult functioning was noted to have 51% of the cases with sufficient information, while child functioning, parenting general and parenting discipline/behavior management averaged 40%.
- The ongoing family functioning assessment is developed to inform the case plan and appropriate interventions for families to address impending danger threats and the family conditions that resulted in the threats. The absence of sufficient information and engagement with the family affects repeat maltreatment, conditions for return, and length of time in out of home care for children. While noted to have made some progress in the

last year, the overall information collection and engagement for case management is an area of need.

Assessing and Scaling of Caregiver Protective Capacities and Child Needs

Data Summary

- 40% of the cases reviewed were found to have sufficient information to support the identified caregiver protective capacities. This represents a 25% increase over the past year.
- 53% of the cases reviewed were found to have sufficient information to support the identified child needs. This represents a 34% increase in the last year.

Areas for Consideration

- Information collection for parenting and parenting discipline was the lowest and was often found to be associated to lack of further engagement with collaterals familiar with the family after case transfer.
- Several cases were found to lack detailed information regarding the parents within the ongoing family functioning assessment and little to no documentation to reflect the assessment of caregiver protective capacities.
- In several cases the case notes did not reflect the case manager engaging with the parents to assess and gather further information.
- In several cases information obtained from collaterals was not related to the information collection.

Case Plan Outcomes

Data Summary

- 29% of the cases were identified by the review team as involving the parent/caregiver in the development of case plan outcomes. Despite having increased during the last review, overall for the year there has been no change in case plan engagement with the family.
- 39% of the cases contained SMART outcomes. This represents an increase during the last year of 16%.

Strengths

- When case plans were developed, there was indication of development of SMART outcomes.

Areas for Consideration

Action4 Child Protection

- Several cases where the case plan outcomes had not been developed or where they were not reflected in the case record.
- Most cases did not reflect engagement with the family in development of the case plan outcomes. Outcomes were frequently service related and, in several cases, outcomes were noted to not be reflective of the family conditions that resulted in children being unsafe.
- Several cases where the caregiver protective capacities were not reflected in the outcomes as areas for change.

Ongoing Safety Management

Data Summary

- 54% of the cases were identified as having active safety management. This represents an increase of 34% during the last year.
- 70% of the cases were assessed for changes to safety plan when indicated. This represents a 25% increase in fidelity during the last year.

Strengths

- Several cases where the safety plan was changed when indicated due to the plan being insufficient.
- Several cases where the safety plan was being actively managed and documented through the case notes to ensure that actions were being taken and safety service providers were performing their tasks.

Areas for Consideration

- Several cases lacked information to inform the ongoing safety management.
- Several cases where there is frequent contact with the out of home safety plan participants, however minimal contact with parents to assess for conditions for return. In particular, lack of assessment of home conditions for the family.

Evaluation of Change/Progress Update

Data Summary

- 27 cases were identified as needing a progress evaluation.
- 25 cases reviewed had a completed progress evaluation.
- 38% of the cases where a progress evaluation was completed contained sufficient information to reflect the change in conditions within the family. This represents a

significant decrease of 29% since the last review in June 2018 and overall decrease for the year for this item.

Strengths


- Progress updates were associated to critical junctures or indicators of needed change to the safety plan.
- Progress updates were completed when indicated. This was a noted increase since the last review of progress updates being completed.

Areas for Consideration

- Several cases contained multiple progress updates. The progress updates were launched and frequently not completed or approved in error.
- Several cases where the progress evaluation was not informed by the assessment of the caregivers' current functioning.
- Case records reflected little to no contact with parents or providers to inform the progress update. Frequently the progress updates were completed due to additional reports or court hearings.


Overview Data Report for Intake, CPI, and Case Management

Region




Answer	%	Count
Central	16.45%	25
Northwest	18.42%	28
Northeast	16.45%	25
Southern	16.45%	25
Southeast	16.45%	25
Suncoast	15.79%	24
Total	100%	152

Screening decision was supported by the case information. Child victim was identified and located in Florida, parent/caregiver responsible for the child is identified as a maltreater, maltreatment and/or danger threat is identified, and means to locate the family are identified in the hotline.




Answer	%	Count
Yes-All screening criteria met	97.37%	148
No-No alleged maltreatment as defined by the FL Child Maltreatment Index and Code	1.32%	2
Unable to determine due to lack of information contained in the hotline narrative.	1.32%	2
Total	100%	152

Response Time Assigned at Hotline




Question	DCF Hotline Counselor Identified		Reviewer Identified		Total
Immediate Response	44.78%	30	55.22%	37	67
24 Hour Response	52.12%	123	47.88%	113	236

1. Present Danger Assessment




Question	Yes		No		Cannot Determine		Total
a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	73.68%	112	22.37%	34	3.95%	6	152
b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	45.39%	69	54.61%	83	0.00%	0	152
c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	76.97%	117	9.87%	15	13.16%	20	152

4. Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?



Answer	%	Count
Yes	95.65%	66
No	4.35%	3
Total	100%	69

This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of i... - Sufficient Information




Question	Yes		No		Total
a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	79.33%	119	20.67%	31	150
b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	74.67%	112	25.33%	38	150
f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	50.34%	75	49.66%	74	149

Action 4 Child Protection

e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	43.62%	65	56.38%	84	149
d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	40.94%	61	59.06%	88	149
c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	39.60%	59	60.40%	90	149


Action4Child Protection

This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “YES” if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.



Answer	%	Count
Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information	37.58%	56
No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.	62.42%	93
Total	100%	149

Impending Danger



Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	Total
a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	53.33% 80	46.67% 70	0.00% 0	150
b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	51.33% 77	30.00% 45	18.67% 28	150

Action4Child Protection

Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to impending danger? Check all that apply. If impending danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any impending danger threats you believe exist in the case.




Action 4 Child Protection

Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child, or the caregiver intended to seriously harm the child.	50.00%	2	50.00%	2	4
Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions endanger a child's physical health.	50.00%	8	50.00%	8	16
There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and/or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates serious harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	3	50.00%	3	6
Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian/caregiver is unwilling or unable to manage.	50.00%	4	50.00%	4	8
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously in way that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	49.26%	67	50.74%	69	136
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food, clothing, and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	22	50.00%	22	44
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	33.33%	1	66.67%	2	3
Other.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0


Action4Child Protection

Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.




Answer	%	Count
Yes	84.15%	69
No	15.85%	13
NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer	0.00%	0
Total	100%	82

Safety Decision




Question	Safe		Unsafe		Unable to Determine due to Insufficient Information in Case Record		Total
a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	45.33%	68	54.67%	82	0.00%	0	150
b.) Reviewer judgment	30.72%	47	50.98%	78	18.30%	28	153

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	27%	21
No	73%	58
NA-Pre-commencement not required per CFOP.	0%	71
Total	100%	150

Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



Answer	%	Count
Yes	99.33%	149
No	0.67%	1
Total	100%	150


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



Answer	%	Count
Yes	48.00%	72
No	52.00%	78
Total	100%	150


Action4Child Protection

Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.




Answer	%	Count
Yes	43.92%	65
No	56.08%	83
Total	100%	148

Does the case transfer to case management due to an unsafe child, as determined by the CPI safety decision?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	53.33%	80
No	46.67%	70
Total	100%	150

1. Safety Plan:




Question	No		Yes, In-Home Safety Plan		Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	3.75%	3	27.50%	22	68.75%	55	0.00%	0	80
b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	2.50%	2	20.00%	16	65.00%	52	12.50%	10	80

2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.




Answer	%	Count
Yes	53.75%	43
No	32.50%	26
Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	13.75%	11
Total	100%	80

3. Safety Plan: Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services.




Answer	%	Count
Yes	59.49%	47
No	24.05%	19
Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	16.46%	13
Total	100%	79

4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented when met.




Answer	%	Count
Yes	47.62%	30
No	44.44%	28
Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	7.94%	5
Total	100%	63

Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.




Answer	%	Count
Yes	55.00%	44
No	45.00%	36
Total	100%	80

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	51.25%	41
No	48.75%	39
Total	100%	80

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	41.25%	33
No	58.75%	47
Total	100%	80

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	41.25%	33
No	58.75%	47
Total	100%	80

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	40.00%	32
No	60.00%	48
Total	100%	80

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



Answer	%	Count
Yes	40.00%	32
No	60.00%	48
Total	100%	80


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



Answer	%	Count
Yes	52.50%	42
No	47.50%	38
Total	100%	80

Action 4 Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



Answer	%	Count
Yes	42.50%	34
No	57.50%	46
Total	100%	80


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




Answer	%	Count
Yes	27.85%	22
No	72.15%	57
Total	100%	79

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	28.75%	23
No	71.25%	57
Total	100%	80

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	38.75%	31
No	61.25%	49
Total	100%	80

Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.




Answer	%	Count
Yes	41.77%	33
No	58.23%	46
Total	100%	79

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents' home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




Answer	%	Count
Yes	53.75%	43
No	46.25%	37
Total	100%	80

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	53.33%	32
No	46.67%	28
Total	100%	60

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




Answer	%	Count
Yes	70.00%	56
No	30.00%	24
Total	100%	80

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	93%	25
No	7%	2
Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	0%	52
Total	100%	79

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




Answer	%	Count
Yes	38.46%	10
No	61.54%	16
Total	100%	26

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	53.85%	14
No	46.15%	12
Total	100%	26

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	61.54%	16
No	38.46%	10
Total	100%	26

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	42.31%	11
No	57.69%	15
Total	100%	26

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	48.00%	12
No	52.00%	13
Total	100%	25

Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	50.00%	13
No	50.00%	13
Total	100%	26

Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)




Answer	%	Count
Yes	50.00%	13
No	50.00%	13
Total	100%	26

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




Answer	%	Count
Yes	57.69%	15
No	42.31%	11
Total	100%	26

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	69.57%	16
No	30.43%	7
Total	100%	23

Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)



Answer	%	Count
Yes	73.08%	19
No	26.92%	7
Total	100%	26


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



Answer	%	Count
Yes	42.50%	34
No	57.50%	46
Total	100%	80


Supervisor CPI Data Report

Region




Answer	%	Count
Central	16.45%	25
Northwest	18.42%	28
Northeast	16.45%	25
Southern	16.45%	25
Southeast	16.45%	25
Suncoast	15.79%	24
Total	100%	152

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	27%	21
No	73%	58
NA-Pre-commencement not required per CFOP.	0%	71
Total	100%	150

Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



Answer	%	Count
Yes	99.33%	149
No	0.67%	1
Total	100%	150


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



Answer	%	Count
Yes	48.00%	72
No	52.00%	78
Total	100%	150

Action4Child Protection


Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.



Answer	%	Count
Yes	43.92%	65
No	56.08%	83
Total	100%	148


Supervisor Report (Safety Unable to Determine by Reviewer)

Region




Answer	%	Count
Central	7.14%	2
Northwest	14.29%	4
Northeast	10.71%	3
Southern	28.57%	8
Southeast	28.57%	8
Suncoast	10.71%	3
Total	100%	28

1. Present Danger Assessment




Question	Yes		No		Cannot Determine		Total
a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	50.00%	14	39.29%	11	10.71%	3	28
b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	7.14%	2	92.86%	26	0.00%	0	28
c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	57.14%	16	14.29%	4	28.57%	8	28

Impending Danger




Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	Total
a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	14.29% 4	85.71% 24	0.00% 0	28
b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00% 28	28

Safety Decision




Question	Safe		Unsafe		Unable to Determine due to Insufficient Information in Case Record		Total
a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	81.48%	22	18.52%	5	0.00%	0	27
b.) Reviewer judgment	6.67%	2	0.00%	0	93.33%	28	30

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?




	Answer	%	Count
	Yes	11%	1
	No	89%	8
	NA-Pre-commencement not required per CFOP.	0%	19
	Total	100%	28

Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



Answer	%	Count
Yes	100.00%	28
No	0.00%	0
Total	100%	28


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



Answer	%	Count
Yes	14.29%	4
No	85.71%	24
Total	100%	28

Action4Child Protection

Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.




Answer	%	Count
Yes	21.43%	6
No	78.57%	22
Total	100%	28

Action 4 Child Protection


Supervisor Report (Safe Determination-Reviewer and CPIS)

Region




Answer	%	Count
Central	22.22%	10
Northwest	20.00%	9
Northeast	20.00%	9
Southern	11.11%	5
Southeast	8.89%	4
Suncoast	17.78%	8
Total	100%	45

1. Present Danger Assessment




Question	Yes		No		Cannot Determine		Total
a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	93.33%	42	6.67%	3	0.00%	0	45
b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	6.67%	3	93.33%	42	0.00%	0	45
c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	97.78%	44	2.22%	1	0.00%	0	45

Impending Danger




Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	Total
a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	0.00% 0	100.00% 45	0.00% 0	45
b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	0.00% 0	97.78% 44	2.22% 1	45

Safety Decision




Question	Safe		Unsafe		Unable to Determine due to Insufficient Information in Case Record		Total
a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	100.00%	45	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	45
b.) Reviewer judgment	97.83%	45	0.00%	0	2.17%	1	46

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?



Answer	%	Count
Yes	32%	9
No	68%	19
NA-Pre-commencement not required per CFOP.	0%	17
Total	100%	45


Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



Answer	%	Count
Yes	97.78%	44
No	2.22%	1
Total	100%	45

Action4Child Protection


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



Answer	%	Count
Yes	44.44%	20
No	55.56%	25
Total	100%	45

Action4Child Protection


Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.



Answer	%	Count
Yes	44.44%	20
No	55.56%	25
Total	100%	45


Supervisor CM Data Report

Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



Answer	%	Count
Yes	41.77%	33
No	58.23%	46
Total	100%	79

Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?




Answer	%	Count
Yes	42.50%	34
No	57.50%	46
Total	100%	80


RSF Closed Case Review and Fidelity Review Comparison Data

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, in particular to explore the interrater reliability of the Critical Child Safety Practice Experts and decision making at case closure for cases identified as requiring Rapid Safety Feedback. 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. Following the RSF review and fidelity review comparison analysis was conducted by Action for Child Protection regarding the assessment of present danger and information collection.

Present Danger Assessment:

Present danger assessments are reviewed by the CCSPE during the course of the assessment and reviewed at investigation closure by Action for Child Protection. Guidance is provided during the open the investigation by the CCSPE, if appropriate, to ensure accurate decision making and documentation regarding the assessment of present danger. Practice fidelity was noted to have increased over the past year for the fidelity sample cases, however has decreased for the RSF sample. This would indicate that children that do not meet the RSF criteria are being assessed with a higher degree of fidelity at present danger than children where there are prior reports, allegations of substance abuse, and violence within the home. Particularly, concerning is the RSF case sample are provided additional oversight, guidance, and case direction to address potential safety concerns, however at case closure the present danger assessments remain insufficient and at times inaccurate.







Information Collection:

Information collection is reviewed by the CCSPE during the course of the investigation. Guidance is offered and provided during the open the investigation by the CCSPE, if appropriate, to ensure accurate decision making and documentation regarding the family functioning assessment. Practice fidelity was noted to have decreased over the past year for the fidelity and RSF sample cases. Information collection is the basis for decision making. Safety determinations are dependent upon the investigation process gathering the necessary, relevant, and sufficient information to ensure accurate safety determinations are being made regarding children and families. Overall, the samples represent that information collection fidelity is declining, despite guidance being provided by the CCSPE for the RSF cases and for the fidelity sample, frequently associated to insufficient, quality case consultation. The impact on information collection can be seen when reviewing the agreement with safety determinations, as frequently when decision making was either not supported or in error upon review, information collection fidelity was noted to be low for the case. Of particular note is that Action does review the entire case record when conducting reviews, and reviewers reported that in cases where the information in the family functioning assessment was noted to be insufficient, the case notes frequently did not provide information to reconcile the safety determination. In summary, the case records in totality, when information is identified as being insufficient in the family functioning assessment, do not support that assessments are being conducted with fidelity to ensure child safety.


Fidelity Review: Information Collection December 2017-2018



CCSPE: Information Collection 2017-2018




1. Present Danger Assessment




#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total
1	a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	75.00% 21	14.29% 4	10.71% 3	28
2	b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	35.71% 10	64.29% 18	0.00% 0	28
3	c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	71.43% 20	7.14% 2	21.43% 6	28

Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	10
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	10

6. Reviewer judgment: Was the present danger safety plan sufficient to control the present danger threats identified?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	10
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	10

This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of i... - Sufficient Information




#	Question	Yes		No		Total
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	65.38%	17	34.62%	9	26
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	65.38%	17	34.62%	9	26
3	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	53.85%	14	46.15%	12	26
4	e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	53.85%	14	46.15%	12	26
5	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	50.00%	13	50.00%	13	26
6	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	46.15%	12	53.85%	14	26

This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “YES” if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information	50.00%	13
2	No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.	50.00%	13
	Total	100%	26

Impending Danger



#	Question	Yes		No		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	53.85%	14	46.15%	12	0.00%	0	26
2	b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	53.85%	14	30.77%	8	15.38%	4	26

Action4Child Protection

Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to impending danger? Check all that apply. If impending danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any impending danger threats you believe exist in the case.




Action 4 Child Protection

#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child, or the caregiver intended to seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions endanger a child's physical health.	50.00%	4	50.00%	4	8
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and/or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates serious harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian/caregiver is unwilling or unable to manage.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
7	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously in way that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	13	50.00%	13	26
8	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food, clothing, and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	5	50.00%	5	10
9	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
10	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0


Action4Child Protection

Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	14
2	No	0.00%	0
3	NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	14

Safety Decision




#	Question	Safe		Unsafe		Unable to Determine due to Insufficient Information in Case Record		Total
1	a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	40.74%	11	59.26%	16	0.00%	0	27
2	b.) Reviewer judgment	32.14%	9	53.57%	15	14.29%	4	28

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50%	2
2	No	50%	2
3	NA-Pre-commencement not required per CFOP.	0%	22
	Total	100%	26

Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	96.15%	25
2	No	3.85%	1
	Total	100%	26


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	53.85%	14
2	No	46.15%	12
	Total	100%	26


Action4Child Protection

Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	65.38%	17
2	No	34.62%	9
	Total	100%	26

Does the case transfer to case management due to an unsafe child, as determined by the CPI safety decision?




#	Answer	%	Count
4	Yes	53.85%	14
5	No	46.15%	12
	Total	100%	26

1. Safety Plan:




#	Question	No		Yes, In-Home Safety Plan		Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	7.14%	1	14.29%	2	78.57%	11	0.00%	0	14
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	7.14%	1	14.29%	2	78.57%	11	0.00%	0	14

2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	92.86%	13
2	No	7.14%	1
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	14

3. Safety Plan: Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	92.86%	13
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	7.14%	1
	Total	100%	14


4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented when met.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	76.92%	10
2	No	23.08%	3
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	13


Action4Child Protection

Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	14
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	14

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	14
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	14

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	14
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	14

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	14
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	14

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	92.86%	13
2	No	7.14%	1
	Total	100%	14

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	14
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	14


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	14
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	14

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	14
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	14


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	13
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	13

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	14
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	14

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	100.00%	14
3	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	14


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	92.86%	13
2	No	7.14%	1
	Total	100%	14


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	14
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	14

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	12
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	12

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	14
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	14

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	46.15%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	53.85%	7
	Total	100%	13

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	85.71%	6
2	No	14.29%	1
	Total	100%	7

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	85.71%	6
2	No	14.29%	1
	Total	100%	7

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	85.71%	6
2	No	14.29%	1
	Total	100%	7

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	85.71%	6
2	No	14.29%	1
	Total	100%	7

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	71.43%	5
2	No	28.57%	2
	Total	100%	7

Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	85.71%	6
2	No	14.29%	1
	Total	100%	7

Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	85.71%	6
2	No	14.29%	1
	Total	100%	7

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6


Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6


Action4Child Protection

Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	71.43%	10
2	No	28.57%	4
	Total	100%	14

1. Present Danger Assessment



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total
1	a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	75.00% 3	25.00% 1	0.00% 0	4
2	b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	25.00% 1	75.00% 3	0.00% 0	4
3	c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	75.00% 3	0.00% 0	25.00% 1	4

Action4Child Protection


3. Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to present danger? Check all that apply. If present danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any present danger safety threats you believe existed in the case.



Action 4 Child Protection


#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child or the caregiver intended to seriously injure the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained, or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions seriously endanger a child's physical health.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and /or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
8	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food clothing and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
9	Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0

4. Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of i... - Sufficient Information




#	Question	Yes		No		Total
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	75.00%	3	25.00%	1	4
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	75.00%	3	25.00%	1	4
3	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	25.00%	1	75.00%	3	4
4	e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	25.00%	1	75.00%	3	4
5	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	25.00%	1	75.00%	3	4
6	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	25.00%	1	75.00%	3	4

This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “YES” if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information	25.00%	1
2	No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.	75.00%	3
	Total	100%	4

Impending Danger



#	Question	Yes		No		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	50.00%	2	50.00%	2	0.00%	0	4
2	b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	50.00%	2	25.00%	1	25.00%	1	4

Action4Child Protection

Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to impending danger? Check all that apply. If impending danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any impending danger threats you believe exist in the case.



Action4Child Protection

#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child, or the caregiver intended to seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions endanger a child's physical health.	50.00%	2	50.00%	2	4
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and/or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates serious harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian/caregiver is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously in way that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	2	50.00%	2	4
8	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food, clothing, and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
9	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0


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

145

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


Action4Child Protection

Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
3	NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Safety Decision




#	Question	Safe		Unsafe		Unable to Determine due to Insufficient Information in Case Record		Total
1	a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	50.00%	2	50.00%	2	0.00%	0	4
2	b.) Reviewer judgment	25.00%	1	50.00%	2	25.00%	1	4

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100%	1
3	NA-Pre-commencement not required per CFOP.	0%	3
	Total	100%	4

Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	4
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	4


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	3
2	No	25.00%	1
	Total	100%	4


Action4Child Protection

Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	3
2	No	25.00%	1
	Total	100%	4

Does the case transfer to case management due to an unsafe child, as determined by the CPI safety decision?




#	Answer	%	Count
4	Yes	50.00%	2
5	No	50.00%	2
	Total	100%	4

1. Safety Plan:




#	Question	No		Yes, In-Home Safety Plan		Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	100.00%	2	0.00%	0	2
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	100.00%	2	0.00%	0	2

2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

3. Safety Plan: Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2


4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented when met.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Families First Network Data Report


Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6


Action4Child Protection

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	83.33%	5
2	No	16.67%	1
	Total	100%	6

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?




#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	100.00%	6
3	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	83.33%	5
2	No	16.67%	1
	Total	100%	6

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	60.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	40.00%	2
	Total	100%	5

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	3
2	No	25.00%	1
	Total	100%	4

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	3
2	No	25.00%	1
	Total	100%	4

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	3
2	No	25.00%	1
	Total	100%	4

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	3
2	No	25.00%	1
	Total	100%	4

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	3
2	No	25.00%	1
	Total	100%	4


Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	3
2	No	25.00%	1
	Total	100%	4

Action 4 Child Protection


Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	3
2	No	25.00%	1
	Total	100%	4


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3


Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3


Action4 Child Protection

Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	2
2	No	66.67%	4
	Total	100%	6

Big Bend CBC Data Report


Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	8
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	8


Action4Child Protection

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	8
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	8

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	8
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	8


Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	8
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	8


Action4Child Protection

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	8
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	8

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	8
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	8


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	8
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	8

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	8
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	8


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	7
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	7

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	8
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	8

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	100.00%	8
3	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	8


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	8
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	8


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	8
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	8

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	8
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	8

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	37.50%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	62.50%	5
	Total	100%	8

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3


Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Action4Child Protection


Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3


Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3


Action 4 Child Protection

Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	8
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	8

1. Present Danger Assessment



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total
1	a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	64.00% 16	32.00% 8	4.00% 1	25
2	b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	56.00% 14	44.00% 11	0.00% 0	25
3	c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	72.00% 18	12.00% 3	16.00% 4	25

Action4Child Protection


3. Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to present danger? Check all that apply. If present danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any present danger safety threats you believe existed in the case.



Action4Child Protection


#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child or the caregiver intended to seriously injure the child.	100.00%	1	0.00%	0	1
2	Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained, or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions seriously endanger a child's physical health.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and /or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	45.00%	9	55.00%	11	20
8	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food clothing and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	33.33%	2	66.67%	4	6
9	Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0

4. Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	14
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	14

6. Reviewer judgment: Was the present danger safety plan sufficient to control the present danger threats identified?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	71.43%	10
2	No	28.57%	4
	Total	100%	14

This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of i... - Sufficient Information




#	Question	Yes		No		Total
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	96.00%	24	4.00%	1	25
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	92.00%	23	8.00%	2	25
3	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	54.17%	13	45.83%	11	24
4	e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	50.00%	12	50.00%	12	24
5	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	45.83%	11	54.17%	13	24
6	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	41.67%	10	58.33%	14	24

This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “YES” if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information	37.50%	9
2	No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.	62.50%	15
	Total	100%	24

Impending Danger



#	Question	Yes		No		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	52.00%	13	48.00%	12	0.00%	0	25
2	b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	48.00%	12	40.00%	10	12.00%	3	25

Action4Child Protection

Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to impending danger? Check all that apply. If impending danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any impending danger threats you believe exist in the case.




Action4Child Protection

#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child, or the caregiver intended to seriously harm the child.	100.00%	1	0.00%	0	1
2	Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	100.00%	1	1
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and/or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates serious harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian/caregiver is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously in way that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	47.62%	10	52.38%	11	21
8	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food, clothing, and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	60.00%	3	40.00%	2	5
9	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
11	Other.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0

Action4Child Protection

Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	13
2	No	0.00%	0
3	NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	13


Safety Decision



SOURCECONFIGDEP.MISCONFIGURED_DATA


Data source misconfigured for this visualization

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	41%	7
2	No	59%	10
3	NA-Pre-commencement not required per CFOP.	0%	8
	Total	100%	25

Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	25
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	25


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	60.00%	15
2	No	40.00%	10
	Total	100%	25


Action4Child Protection

Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	52.00%	13
2	No	48.00%	12
	Total	100%	25

1. Safety Plan:




#	Question	No		Yes, In-Home Safety Plan		Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	0.00%	0	53.85%	7	46.15%	6	0.00%	0	13
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	7.69%	1	38.46%	5	38.46%	5	15.38%	2	13

2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	53.85%	7
2	No	38.46%	5
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	7.69%	1
	Total	100%	13

3. Safety Plan: Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	61.54%	8
2	No	15.38%	2
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	23.08%	3
	Total	100%	13

4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented when met.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	37.50%	3
2	No	62.50%	5
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	8

Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	38.46%	5
2	No	61.54%	8
	Total	100%	13

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	61.54%	8
2	No	38.46%	5
	Total	100%	13

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	46.15%	6
2	No	53.85%	7
	Total	100%	13

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	46.15%	6
2	No	53.85%	7
	Total	100%	13

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	38.46%	5
2	No	61.54%	8
	Total	100%	13

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	38.46%	5
2	No	61.54%	8
	Total	100%	13


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	61.54%	8
2	No	38.46%	5
	Total	100%	13

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	30.77%	4
2	No	69.23%	9
	Total	100%	13


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	38.46%	5
2	No	61.54%	8
	Total	100%	13

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	30.77%	4
2	No	69.23%	9
	Total	100%	13

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?




#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	23.08%	3
3	No	76.92%	10
	Total	100%	13

Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	23.08%	3
2	No	76.92%	10
	Total	100%	13

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	84.62%	11
2	No	15.38%	2
	Total	100%	13

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	4
2	No	50.00%	4
	Total	100%	8

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	13
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	13

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	30.77%	4
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	69.23%	9
	Total	100%	13

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	3
2	No	25.00%	1
	Total	100%	4

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	4
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	4

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	4
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	4


Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	3
2	No	25.00%	1
	Total	100%	4


Action4Child Protection

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	4
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	4

Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	4
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	4

Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	38.46%	5
2	No	61.54%	8
	Total	100%	13


Does the case transfer to case management due to an unsafe child, as determined by the CPI safety decision?



#	Answer	%	Count
4	Yes	52.00%	13
5	No	48.00%	12
	Total	100%	25


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	4
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	4

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	3
2	No	25.00%	1
	Total	100%	4


Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	4
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	4


NER Family Integrity Program Data Report

Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	0.00%	0
3	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2


NER Community Partnership for Children Data Report

Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?




#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	0.00%	0
3	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


NER Family Support Services of North Florida Data Report

Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	20.00%	1
2	No	80.00%	4
	Total	100%	5

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	20.00%	1
2	No	80.00%	4
	Total	100%	5

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	0.00%	0
3	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	20.00%	1
2	No	80.00%	4
	Total	100%	5


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	5
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	5

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	5
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	5

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	20.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	80.00%	4
	Total	100%	5

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	20.00%	1
2	No	80.00%	4
	Total	100%	5


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1


Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Action4Child Protection


Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1


NER Kids First of Florida Data

Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	0.00%	0
3	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2

NER Partnership for Strong Families Data Report


Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Action4Child Protection


Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	100.00%	3
3	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2


Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

1. Present Danger Assessment



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total
1	a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	68.00% 17	32.00% 8	0.00% 0	25
2	b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	44.00% 11	56.00% 14	0.00% 0	25
3	c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	80.00% 20	8.00% 2	12.00% 3	25

Action4Child Protection


3. Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to present danger? Check all that apply. If present danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any present danger safety threats you believe existed in the case.



Action4Child Protection


#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child or the caregiver intended to seriously injure the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained, or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions seriously endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and /or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	47.37%	9	52.63%	10	19
8	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food clothing and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
9	Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0

4. Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	90.91%	10
2	No	9.09%	1
	Total	100%	11

6. Reviewer judgment: Was the present danger safety plan sufficient to control the present danger threats identified?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	80.00%	8
2	No	20.00%	2
	Total	100%	10


This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of i... - Sufficient Information



#	Question	Yes		No		Total
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	84.00%	21	16.00%	4	25
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	80.00%	20	20.00%	5	25
3	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	40.00%	10	60.00%	15	25
4	e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	36.00%	9	64.00%	16	25
5	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	28.00%	7	72.00%	18	25
6	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	28.00%	7	72.00%	18	25


Action4Child Protection

This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “YES” if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information	28.00%	7
2	No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.	72.00%	18
	Total	100%	25

Impending Danger



#	Question	Yes		No		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	52.00%	13	48.00%	12	0.00%	0	25
2	b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	52.00%	13	40.00%	10	8.00%	2	25

Action4Child Protection

Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to impending danger? Check all that apply. If impending danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any impending danger threats you believe exist in the case.



Action 4 Child Protection

#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child, or the caregiver intended to seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions endanger a child's physical health.	100.00%	2	0.00%	0	2
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and/or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates serious harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	100.00%	1	0.00%	0	1
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian/caregiver is unwilling or unable to manage.	66.67%	2	33.33%	1	3
7	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously in way that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	10	50.00%	10	20
8	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food, clothing, and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	3	50.00%	3	6
9	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0


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

373

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


Action4Child Protection

Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	85.71%	12
2	No	14.29%	2
3	NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	14

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	15%	3
2	No	85%	17
3	NA-Pre-commencement not required per CFOP.	0%	5
	Total	100%	25

Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	25
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	25


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	64.00%	16
2	No	36.00%	9
	Total	100%	25


Action4Child Protection

Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	34.78%	8
2	No	65.22%	15
	Total	100%	23

1. Safety Plan:




#	Question	No		Yes, In-Home Safety Plan		Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	7.69%	1	38.46%	5	53.85%	7	0.00%	0	13
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	0.00%	0	38.46%	5	46.15%	6	15.38%	2	13

2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	23.08%	3
2	No	38.46%	5
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	38.46%	5
	Total	100%	13

3. Safety Plan: Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	91.67%	11
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	8.33%	1
	Total	100%	12

4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented when met.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	11.11%	1
2	No	77.78%	7
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	11.11%	1
	Total	100%	9

Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	15.38%	2
2	No	84.62%	11
	Total	100%	13

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	23.08%	3
2	No	76.92%	10
	Total	100%	13

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	23.08%	3
2	No	76.92%	10
	Total	100%	13

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	23.08%	3
2	No	76.92%	10
	Total	100%	13

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	23.08%	3
2	No	76.92%	10
	Total	100%	13

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	23.08%	3
2	No	76.92%	10
	Total	100%	13


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	30.77%	4
2	No	69.23%	9
	Total	100%	13

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	7.69%	1
2	No	92.31%	12
	Total	100%	13


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	7.69%	1
2	No	92.31%	12
	Total	100%	13

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	13
	Total	100%	13

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	23.08%	3
3	No	76.92%	10
	Total	100%	13


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	41.67%	5
2	No	58.33%	7
	Total	100%	12


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	46.15%	6
2	No	53.85%	7
	Total	100%	13

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	4
2	No	50.00%	4
	Total	100%	8

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	69.23%	9
2	No	30.77%	4
	Total	100%	13

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	7.69%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	92.31%	12
	Total	100%	13

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	30.77%	4
2	No	69.23%	9
	Total	100%	13


Does the case transfer to case management due to an unsafe child, as determined by the CPI safety decision?



#	Answer	%	Count
4	Yes	52.00%	13
5	No	48.00%	12
	Total	100%	25


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1


Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1


Action4Child Protection

Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

1. Present Danger Assessment




#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total
1	a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	66.67% 2	33.33% 1	0.00% 0	3
2	b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	0.00% 0	100.00% 3	0.00% 0	3
3	c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	66.67% 2	33.33% 1	0.00% 0	3

Action4Child Protection

Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to present danger? Check all that apply. If present danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any present danger safety threats you believe existed in the case.

Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child or the caregiver intended to seriously injure the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained, or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions seriously endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and /or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food clothing and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
Other	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0


This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of i... - Sufficient Information



#	Question	Yes	No	Total
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	66.67%	33.33%	3
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	66.67%	33.33%	3
3	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	33.33%	66.67%	3
4	e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	33.33%	66.67%	3
5	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	33.33%	66.67%	3
6	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	33.33%	66.67%	3


Action4Child Protection

This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “YES” if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information	33.33%	1
2	No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Impending Danger



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	Total
1	a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	33.33% 1	66.67% 2	0.00% 0	3
2	b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	0.00% 0	66.67% 2	33.33% 1	3

Action4Child Protection

Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to impending danger? Check all that apply. If impending danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any impending danger threats you believe exist in the case.



Action4Child Protection

#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child, or the caregiver intended to seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and/or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates serious harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian/caregiver is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously in way that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	100.00%	1	1
8	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food, clothing, and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
9	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0


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

417

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


Action4Child Protection

Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
3	NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Safety Decision




#	Question	Safe		Unsafe		Unable to Determine due to Insufficient Information in Case Record		Total
1	a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	66.67%	2	33.33%	1	0.00%	0	3
2	b.) Reviewer judgment	66.67%	2	0.00%	0	33.33%	1	3

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100%	2
3	NA-Pre-commencement not required per CFOP.	0%	1
	Total	100%	3

Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Does the case transfer to case management due to an unsafe child, as determined by the CPI safety decision?




#	Answer	%	Count
4	Yes	33.33%	1
5	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

1. Safety Plan:




#	Question	No		Yes, In-Home Safety Plan		Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	100.00%	1	0.00%	0	1
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	100.00%	1	1

2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1


4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented when met.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

CNT Kids Central Data Report


Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	33.33%	1
3	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


CNT Community Based Care of Central Florida Data Report

Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3




Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	33.33%	1
3	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1


Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1


Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1


Action4Child Protection

Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

CNT Heartland for Children Data Report


Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	0.00%	0
3	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3


CNT Brevard Family Partnership Data Report

Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	33.33%	1
3	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2




The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

CNT Community Based Care of Central Florida: Seminole County Data Report


Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1


Action4Child Protection

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	0.00%	0
3	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1


Suncoast Region Data Report: CPI and CM

Region



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Suncoast	100.00%	24
	Total	100%	24

1. Present Danger Assessment



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total
1	a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	87.50% 21	4.17% 1	8.33% 2	24
2	b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	54.17% 13	45.83% 11	0.00% 0	24
3	c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	87.50% 21	4.17% 1	8.33% 2	24

Action4Child Protection

3. Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to present danger? Check all that apply. If present danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any present danger safety threats you believe existed in the case.



Action4Child Protection


#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child or the caregiver intended to seriously injure the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained, or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions seriously endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and /or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	12	50.00%	12	24
8	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food clothing and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	4	50.00%	4	8
9	Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0

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

526


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

4. Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	84.62%	11
2	No	15.38%	2
	Total	100%	13

6. Reviewer judgment: Was the present danger safety plan sufficient to control the present danger threats identified?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	72.73%	8
2	No	27.27%	3
	Total	100%	11


This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of i... - Sufficient Information



#	Question	Yes		No	Total
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	91.67%	22	8.33%	24
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	91.67%	22	8.33%	24
3	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	83.33%	20	16.67%	24
4	e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	79.17%	19	20.83%	24
5	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	75.00%	18	25.00%	24
6	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	79.17%	19	20.83%	24


Action4Child Protection

This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “YES” if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information	75.00%	18
2	No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.	25.00%	6
	Total	100%	24

Impending Danger



#	Question	Yes		No		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	Total
1	a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	50.00%	12	50.00%	12	0.00%	24
2	b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	54.17%	13	33.33%	8	12.50%	24

Action4Child Protection

Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to impending danger? Check all that apply. If impending danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any impending danger threats you believe exist in the case.



Action 4 Child Protection

#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child, or the caregiver intended to seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and/or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates serious harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian/caregiver is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously in way that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	52.00%	13	48.00%	12	25
8	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food, clothing, and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	3	50.00%	3	6
9	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0


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

533

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


Action4Child Protection

Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	76.92%	10
2	No	23.08%	3
3	NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	13

Safety Decision




#	Question	Safe		Unsafe		Unable to Determine due to Insufficient Information in Case Record		Total
1	a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	50.00%	12	50.00%	12	0.00%	0	24
2	b.) Reviewer judgment	33.33%	8	54.17%	13	12.50%	3	24

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	12.50%	3
2	No	87.50%	21
3	NA-Pre-commencement not required per CFOP.	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	24

Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	24
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	24


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	16
2	No	33.33%	8
	Total	100%	24


Action4Child Protection

Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	16
2	No	33.33%	8
	Total	100%	24

Does the case transfer to case management due to an unsafe child, as determined by the CPI safety decision?




#	Answer	%	Count
4	Yes	50.00%	12
5	No	50.00%	12
	Total	100%	24

1. Safety Plan:




#	Question	No		Yes, In-Home Safety Plan		Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	0.00%	0	8.33%	1	91.67%	11	0.00%	0	12
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	83.33%	10	16.67%	2	12

2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	9
2	No	8.33%	1
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	16.67%	2
	Total	100%	12

3. Safety Plan: Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	41.67%	5
2	No	8.33%	1
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	50.00%	6
	Total	100%	12


4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented when met.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	90.91%	10
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	9.09%	1
	Total	100%	11


Action4Child Protection

Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	8
2	No	33.33%	4
	Total	100%	12

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	58.33%	7
2	No	41.67%	5
	Total	100%	12

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	4
2	No	66.67%	8
	Total	100%	12

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	3
2	No	75.00%	9
	Total	100%	12


Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	3
2	No	75.00%	9
	Total	100%	12




Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	3
2	No	75.00%	9
	Total	100%	12


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	58.33%	7
2	No	41.67%	5
	Total	100%	12

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	6
2	No	50.00%	6
	Total	100%	12


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	12
	Total	100%	12

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	8.33%	1
2	No	91.67%	11
	Total	100%	12

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?




#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	25.00%	3
3	No	75.00%	9
	Total	100%	12

Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	58.33%	7
2	No	41.67%	5
	Total	100%	12

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	6
2	No	50.00%	6
	Total	100%	12

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	60.00%	6
2	No	40.00%	4
	Total	100%	10

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	9
2	No	25.00%	3
	Total	100%	12

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	58.33%	7
2	No	8.33%	1
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	33.33%	4
	Total	100%	12

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	7
	Total	100%	7

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	14.29%	1
2	No	85.71%	6
	Total	100%	7

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	42.86%	3
2	No	57.14%	4
	Total	100%	7

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	14.29%	1
2	No	85.71%	6
	Total	100%	7

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	28.57%	2
2	No	71.43%	5
	Total	100%	7

Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	28.57%	2
2	No	71.43%	5
	Total	100%	7


Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	14.29%	1
2	No	85.71%	6
	Total	100%	7


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	42.86%	3
2	No	57.14%	4
	Total	100%	7

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	4
2	No	33.33%	2
	Total	100%	6

Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	71.43%	5
2	No	28.57%	2
	Total	100%	7

Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	8
2	No	33.33%	4
	Total	100%	12

1. Present Danger Assessment



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total
1	a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	66.67%	16.67%	16.67%	6
2	b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	6
3	c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	66.67%	16.67%	16.67%	6

Action4Child Protection


3. Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to present danger? Check all that apply. If present danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any present danger safety threats you believe existed in the case.



Action4Child Protection


#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child or the caregiver intended to seriously injure the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained, or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions seriously endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and /or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	3	50.00%	3	6
8	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food clothing and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	3	50.00%	3	6
9	Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0

4. Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	4
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	4


6. Reviewer judgment: Was the present danger safety plan sufficient to control the present danger threats identified?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	4
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	4


Action4 Child Protection

This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of i... - Sufficient Information




#	Question	Yes	No	Total
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	66.67%	33.33%	6
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	66.67%	33.33%	6
3	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	83.33%	16.67%	6
4	e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	66.67%	33.33%	6
5	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	50.00%	50.00%	6
6	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	66.67%	33.33%	6

This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “YES” if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information	50.00%	3
2	No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.	50.00%	3
	Total	100%	6

Impending Danger



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	Total
1	a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	50.00% 3	50.00% 3	0.00% 0	6
2	b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	50.00% 3	16.67% 1	33.33% 2	6

Action4Child Protection

Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to impending danger? Check all that apply. If impending danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any impending danger threats you believe exist in the case.



Action4 Child Protection

#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child, or the caregiver intended to seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and/or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates serious harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian/caregiver is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously in way that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	3	50.00%	3	6
8	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food, clothing, and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	2	50.00%	2	4
9	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0


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

581

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


Action4Child Protection

Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
3	NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Safety Decision




#	Question	Safe		Unsafe		Unable to Determine due to Insufficient Information in Case Record		Total
1	a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	50.00%	3	50.00%	3	0.00%	0	6
2	b.) Reviewer judgment	16.67%	1	50.00%	3	33.33%	2	6

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	16.67%	1
2	No	83.33%	5
3	NA-Pre-commencement not required per CFOP.	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6


Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	6
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

Action4Child Protection


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	3
2	No	50.00%	3
	Total	100%	6


Action4Child Protection

Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	2
2	No	66.67%	4
	Total	100%	6

Does the case transfer to case management due to an unsafe child, as determined by the CPI safety decision?




#	Answer	%	Count
4	Yes	50.00%	3
5	No	50.00%	3
	Total	100%	6

1. Safety Plan:




#	Question	No		Yes, In-Home Safety Plan		Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	100.00%	3	0.00%	0	3
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	100.00%	3	0.00%	0	3

2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

3. Safety Plan: Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented when met.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

1. Present Danger Assessment



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total
1	a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	2
2	b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	2
3	c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	2

Action4Child Protection


3. Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to present danger? Check all that apply. If present danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any present danger safety threats you believe existed in the case.



Action 4 Child Protection


#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child or the caregiver intended to seriously injure the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained, or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions seriously endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and /or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
8	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food clothing and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
9	Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0

4. Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

6. Reviewer judgment: Was the present danger safety plan sufficient to control the present danger threats identified?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1


This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of i... - Sufficient Information



#	Question	Yes		No		Total
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	100.00%	2	0.00%	0	2
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	100.00%	2	0.00%	0	2
3	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	100.00%	2	0.00%	0	2
4	e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	100.00%	2	0.00%	0	2
5	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	100.00%	2	0.00%	0	2
6	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	100.00%	2	0.00%	0	2


Action4Child Protection

This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “YES” if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information	100.00%	2
2	No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Impending Danger



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	Total
1	a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	2
2	b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	2

Action4Child Protection

Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to impending danger? Check all that apply. If impending danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any impending danger threats you believe exist in the case.

Reviewer Identified	Worker Identified	Safety Threats
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious harm to the child;... <input type="checkbox"/> Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unlikely to be resolved without intervention... <input type="checkbox"/> The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been injured... <input type="checkbox"/> There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs... <input type="checkbox"/> Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks the ability to function... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child;... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in a sexually abusive manner... <input type="checkbox"/> Other.

Action4Child Protection

#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child, or the caregiver intended to seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and/or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates serious harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian/caregiver is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously in way that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
8	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food, clothing, and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
9	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0


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

602

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


Action4Child Protection

Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
3	NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Safety Decision




#	Question	Safe		Unsafe		Unable to Determine due to Insufficient Information in Case Record		Total
1	a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	0.00%	0	2
2	b.) Reviewer judgment	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	0.00%	0	2

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
3	NA-Pre-commencement not required per CFOP.	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2


Action4Child Protection

Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Does the case transfer to case management due to an unsafe child, as determined by the CPI safety decision?




#	Answer	%	Count
4	Yes	50.00%	1
5	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

1. Safety Plan:




#	Question	No		Yes, In-Home Safety Plan		Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	100.00%	1	0.00%	0	1
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	100.00%	1	1

2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

3. Safety Plan: Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented when met.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

1. Present Danger Assessment



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total
1	a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	100.00% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	2
2	b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	2
3	c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	100.00% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	2

Action4Child Protection


3. Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to present danger? Check all that apply. If present danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any present danger safety threats you believe existed in the case.

Reviewer Identified	Worker Identified	Safety Threats
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical... <input type="checkbox"/> Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is u... <input type="checkbox"/> The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has ahead... <input type="checkbox"/> There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be asc... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's essential medical needs an... <input type="checkbox"/> Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks ... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways ... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for ... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearfu... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely... <input type="checkbox"/> Other

Action 4 Child Protection


#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child or the caregiver intended to seriously injure the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained, or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions seriously endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and /or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
8	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food clothing and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
9	Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0

4. Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1


6. Reviewer judgment: Was the present danger safety plan sufficient to control the present danger threats identified?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Action4Child Protection


This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of i... - Sufficient Information



#	Question	Yes		No		Total
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	100.00%	2	0.00%	0	2
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	100.00%	2	0.00%	0	2
3	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	100.00%	2	0.00%	0	2
4	e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	100.00%	2	0.00%	0	2
5	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	100.00%	2	0.00%	0	2
6	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	100.00%	2	0.00%	0	2

Action4Child Protection

This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “YES” if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information	100.00%	2
2	No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Impending Danger



#	Question	Yes		No		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	0.00%	0	2
2	b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	0.00%	0	2

Action4Child Protection

Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to impending danger? Check all that apply. If impending danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any impending danger threats you believe exist in the case.

Reviewer Identified	Worker Identified	Safety Threats
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious harm to the child;... <input type="checkbox"/> Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unlikely to be resolved without intervention... <input type="checkbox"/> The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been injured... <input type="checkbox"/> There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs... <input type="checkbox"/> Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks appropriate social skills... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child;... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in a sexually abusive manner... <input type="checkbox"/> Other.

Action4Child Protection

#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child, or the caregiver intended to seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and/or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates serious harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian/caregiver is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously in way that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
8	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food, clothing, and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
9	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0


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

623

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


Action4Child Protection

Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
3	NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

Safety Decision




#	Question	Safe		Unsafe		Unable to Determine due to Insufficient Information in Case Record		Total
1	a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	0.00%	0	2
2	b.) Reviewer judgment	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	0.00%	0	2

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
3	NA-Precommencement not required per CFOP.	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2


Action4Child Protection

Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Does the case transfer to case management due to an unsafe child, as determined by the CPI safety decision?




#	Answer	%	Count
4	Yes	50.00%	1
5	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

1. Safety Plan:




#	Question	No		Yes, In-Home Safety Plan		Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	100.00%	1	0.00%	0	1
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	100.00%	1	0.00%	0	1

2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

3. Safety Plan: Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented when met.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

1. Present Danger Assessment



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total
1	a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	100.00% 4	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	4
2	b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	50.00% 2	50.00% 2	0.00% 0	4
3	c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	100.00% 4	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	4

Action4Child Protection


3. Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to present danger? Check all that apply. If present danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any present danger safety threats you believe existed in the case.

Reviewer Identified	Worker Identified	Safety Threats
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical... <input type="checkbox"/> Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is u... <input type="checkbox"/> The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has ahead... <input type="checkbox"/> There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be asc... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's essential medical needs an... <input type="checkbox"/> Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks ... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways ... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for ... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearfu... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely... <input type="checkbox"/> Other

Action 4 Child Protection


#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child or the caregiver intended to seriously injure the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained, or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions seriously endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and /or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	2	50.00%	2	4
8	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food clothing and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
9	Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0

4. Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2


6. Reviewer judgment: Was the present danger safety plan sufficient to control the present danger threats identified?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2


Action4Child Protection

This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of i... - Sufficient Information




#	Question	Yes		No		Total
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	100.00%	4	0.00%	0	4
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	100.00%	4	0.00%	0	4
3	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	100.00%	4	0.00%	0	4
4	e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	100.00%	4	0.00%	0	4
5	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	100.00%	4	0.00%	0	4
6	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	100.00%	4	0.00%	0	4

This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “YES” if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information	100.00%	4
2	No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	4

Impending Danger



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	Total
1	a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	50.00% 2	50.00% 2	0.00% 0	4
2	b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	50.00% 2	50.00% 2	0.00% 0	4

Action4Child Protection

Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to impending danger? Check all that apply. If impending danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any impending danger threats you believe exist in the case.

Reviewer Identified	Worker Identified	Safety Threats
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious harm to the child;... <input type="checkbox"/> Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unlikely to be resolved without intervention... <input type="checkbox"/> The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been injured... <input type="checkbox"/> There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs... <input type="checkbox"/> Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks appropriate social skills... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child;... <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in a sexually abusive manner... <input type="checkbox"/> Other.

Action4Child Protection

#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child, or the caregiver intended to seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and/or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates serious harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian/caregiver is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously in way that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	2	50.00%	2	4
8	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food, clothing, and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
9	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0


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

644

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


Action4Child Protection

Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
3	NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Safety Decision




#	Question	Safe		Unsafe		Unable to Determine due to Insufficient Information in Case Record		Total
1	a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	50.00%	2	50.00%	2	0.00%	0	4
2	b.) Reviewer judgment	50.00%	2	50.00%	2	0.00%	0	4

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	1
2	No	75.00%	3
3	NA-Precommencement not required per CFOP.	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	4

Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	4
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	4


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	4
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	4


Action4Child Protection

Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	3
2	No	25.00%	1
	Total	100%	4

Does the case transfer to case management due to an unsafe child, as determined by the CPI safety decision?




#	Answer	%	Count
4	Yes	50.00%	2
5	No	50.00%	2
	Total	100%	4

1. Safety Plan:




#	Question	No		Yes, In-Home Safety Plan		Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	0.00%	0	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	0.00%	0	2
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2

2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

3. Safety Plan: Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2


4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented when met.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	1

SCR Eckerd Community Alternatives Data Report


Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	83.33%	5
2	No	16.67%	1
	Total	100%	6


Action4Child Protection

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	3
2	No	50.00%	3
	Total	100%	6

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	2
2	No	66.67%	4
	Total	100%	6

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	2
2	No	66.67%	4
	Total	100%	6

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	2
2	No	66.67%	4
	Total	100%	6


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	2
2	No	66.67%	4
	Total	100%	6

Action4Child Protection


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	3
2	No	50.00%	3
	Total	100%	6

Action4 Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	2
2	No	66.67%	4
	Total	100%	6


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	6
	Total	100%	6

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	16.67%	1
2	No	83.33%	5
	Total	100%	6

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	33.33%	2
3	No	66.67%	4
	Total	100%	6


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	3
2	No	50.00%	3
	Total	100%	6


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	2
2	No	66.67%	4
	Total	100%	6

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	2
2	No	50.00%	2
	Total	100%	4

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	4
2	No	33.33%	2
	Total	100%	6


Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	83.33%	5
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	16.67%	1
	Total	100%	6




Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	20.00%	1
2	No	80.00%	4
	Total	100%	5

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	20.00%	1
2	No	80.00%	4
	Total	100%	5

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	20.00%	1
2	No	80.00%	4
	Total	100%	5

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	20.00%	1
2	No	80.00%	4
	Total	100%	5

Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	40.00%	2
2	No	60.00%	3
	Total	100%	5


Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	20.00%	1
2	No	80.00%	4
	Total	100%	5


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	40.00%	2
2	No	60.00%	3
	Total	100%	5


Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	3
2	No	25.00%	1
	Total	100%	4


Action 4 Child Protection

Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	60.00%	3
2	No	40.00%	2
	Total	100%	5


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	3
2	No	50.00%	3
	Total	100%	6

SCR Sarasota Y/ Safe Family Coalition Data Report


Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	33.33%	1
3	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3


SCR Children's Network of SW Florida Data Report

Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Action4Child Protection


Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3




Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3

Action4 Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	1
2	No	66.67%	2
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	0.00%	0
3	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	2
2	No	33.33%	1
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2


Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2

Action4Child Protection


Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	3

1. Present Danger Assessment



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total
1	a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	80.00% 20	20.00% 5	0.00% 0	25
2	b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	44.00% 11	56.00% 14	0.00% 0	25
3	c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	80.00% 20	16.00% 4	4.00% 1	25

Action4Child Protection


3. Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to present danger? Check all that apply. If present danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any present danger safety threats you believe existed in the case.



Action 4 Child Protection


#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child or the caregiver intended to seriously injure the child.	0.00%	0	100.00%	2	2
2	Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained, or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions seriously endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	100.00%	1	1
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and /or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	8	50.00%	8	16
8	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food clothing and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	60.00%	3	40.00%	2	5
9	Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0

4. Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	11
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	11

6. Reviewer judgment: Was the present danger safety plan sufficient to control the present danger threats identified?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	18.18%	2
2	No	81.82%	9
	Total	100%	11


This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of i... - Sufficient Information



#	Question	Yes	No	Total
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	68.00% 17	32.00% 8	25
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	64.00% 16	36.00% 9	25
3	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	24.00% 6	76.00% 19	25
4	e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	12.00% 3	88.00% 22	25
5	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	4.00% 1	96.00% 24	25
6	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	4.00% 1	96.00% 24	25


Action4Child Protection

This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “YES” if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information	4.00%	1
2	No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.	96.00%	24
	Total	100%	25


Impending Danger



#	Question	Yes		No		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	60.00%	15	40.00%	10	0.00%	0	25
2	b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	52.00%	13	16.00%	4	32.00%	8	25


Action4Child Protection

Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	10
2	No	33.33%	5
3	NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	15

Safety Decision




#	Question	Safe	Unsafe	Unable to Determine due to Insufficient Information in Case Record	Total
1	a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	37.50% 9	62.50% 15	0.00% 0	24
2	b.) Reviewer judgment	19.23% 5	50.00% 13	30.77% 8	26

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100%	3
2	No	0.00%	0
3	NA-Pre-commencement not required per CFOP.	0	22
	Total	100%	25

Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	25
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	25


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	12.00%	3
2	No	88.00%	22
	Total	100%	25


Action 4 Child Protection

Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	20.00%	5
2	No	80.00%	20
	Total	100%	25

Does the case transfer to case management due to an unsafe child, as determined by the CPI safety decision?




#	Answer	%	Count
4	Yes	60.00%	15
5	No	40.00%	10
	Total	100%	25

1. Safety Plan:




#	Question	No		Yes, In-Home Safety Plan		Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	6.67%	1	33.33%	5	60.00%	9	0.00%	0	15
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	0.00%	0	20.00%	3	66.67%	10	13.33%	2	15

2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	26.67%	4
2	No	66.67%	10
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	6.67%	1
	Total	100%	15

3. Safety Plan: Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	20.00%	3
2	No	80.00%	12
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	15

4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented when met.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	9.09%	1
2	No	90.91%	10
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	11

Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	10
2	No	33.33%	5
	Total	100%	15

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	13.33%	2
2	No	86.67%	13
	Total	100%	15

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	13.33%	2
2	No	86.67%	13
	Total	100%	15

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	13.33%	2
2	No	86.67%	13
	Total	100%	15

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	13.33%	2
2	No	86.67%	13
	Total	100%	15

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	13.33%	2
2	No	86.67%	13
	Total	100%	15


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	13.33%	2
2	No	86.67%	13
	Total	100%	15

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	6.67%	1
2	No	93.33%	14
	Total	100%	15


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	13.33%	2
2	No	86.67%	13
	Total	100%	15

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	20.00%	3
2	No	80.00%	12
	Total	100%	15

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	13.33%	2
3	No	86.67%	13
	Total	100%	15


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	13.33%	2
2	No	86.67%	13
	Total	100%	15


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	13.33%	2
2	No	86.67%	13
	Total	100%	15

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	9.09%	1
2	No	90.91%	10
	Total	100%	11

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	13.33%	2
2	No	86.67%	13
	Total	100%	15

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	5
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	66.67%	10
	Total	100%	15

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5

Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5


Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	6
	Total	100%	6


Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	4
	Total	100%	4


Action4Child Protection

Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	16.67%	1
2	No	83.33%	5
	Total	100%	6

Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	13.33%	2
2	No	86.67%	13
	Total	100%	15

1. Present Danger Assessment



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total
1	a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	77.78% 7	22.22% 2	0.00% 0	9
2	b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	55.56% 5	44.44% 4	0.00% 0	9
3	c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	77.78% 7	22.22% 2	0.00% 0	9

Action4Child Protection


3. Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to present danger? Check all that apply. If present danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any present danger safety threats you believe existed in the case.



Action 4 Child Protection


#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child or the caregiver intended to seriously injure the child.	0.00%	0	100.00%	1	1
2	Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained, or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions seriously endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	100.00%	1	1
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and /or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	4	50.00%	4	8
8	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food clothing and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	66.67%	2	33.33%	1	3
9	Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0

4. Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	5
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	5


This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of i... - Sufficient Information



#	Question	Yes		No		Total
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	66.67%	6	33.33%	3	9
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	55.56%	5	44.44%	4	9
3	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	11.11%	1	88.89%	8	9
4	e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	22.22%	2	77.78%	7	9
5	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	0.00%	0	100.00%	9	9
6	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	0.00%	0	100.00%	9	9


Action4Child Protection

This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “YES” if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information	0.00%	0
2	No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.	100.00%	9
	Total	100%	9

Impending Danger



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	Total
1	a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	66.67% 6	33.33% 3	0.00% 0	9
2	b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	66.67% 6	11.11% 1	22.22% 2	9

Action4Child Protection

Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to impending danger? Check all that apply. If impending danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any impending danger threats you believe exist in the case.



Action4Child Protection

#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child, or the caregiver intended to seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
2	Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions endanger a child's physical health.	0.00%	0	100.00%	1	1
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and/or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates serious harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	33.33%	1	66.67%	2	3
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian/caregiver is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	100.00%	1	1
7	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously in way that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	5	50.00%	5	10
8	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food, clothing, and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	3	50.00%	3	6
9	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	100.00%	1	1
11	Other.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0


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

781

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


Action4Child Protection

Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	4
2	No	33.33%	2
3	NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

Safety Decision




#	Question	Safe		Unsafe		Unable to Determine due to Insufficient Information in Case Record		Total
1	a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	33.33%	3	66.67%	6	0.00%	0	9
2	b.) Reviewer judgment	11.11%	1	66.67%	6	22.22%	2	9

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
3	NA-Pre-commencement not required per CFOP.	0%	7
	Total	100%	9


Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	9
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	9

Action4Child Protection


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	9
	Total	100%	9


Action4Child Protection

Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	11.11%	1
2	No	88.89%	8
	Total	100%	9

Does the case transfer to case management due to an unsafe child, as determined by the CPI safety decision?




#	Answer	%	Count
4	Yes	66.67%	6
5	No	33.33%	3
	Total	100%	9

1. Safety Plan:




#	Question	No		Yes, In-Home Safety Plan		Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	16.67%	1	0.00%	0	83.33%	5	0.00%	0	6
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	100.00%	6	0.00%	0	6

2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	2
2	No	66.67%	4
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

3. Safety Plan: Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	16.67%	1
2	No	83.33%	5
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6


4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented when met.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	6
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	6

SER Child Net Data Report


Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	63.64%	7
2	No	36.36%	4
	Total	100%	11


Action4Child Protection

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	9.09%	1
2	No	90.91%	10
	Total	100%	11

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	9.09%	1
2	No	90.91%	10
	Total	100%	11

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	9.09%	1
2	No	90.91%	10
	Total	100%	11

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	9.09%	1
2	No	90.91%	10
	Total	100%	11

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	9.09%	1
2	No	90.91%	10
	Total	100%	11


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	9.09%	1
2	No	90.91%	10
	Total	100%	11

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	9.09%	1
2	No	90.91%	10
	Total	100%	11


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	9.09%	1
2	No	90.91%	10
	Total	100%	11

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	27.27%	3
2	No	72.73%	8
	Total	100%	11

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	9.09%	1
3	No	90.91%	10
	Total	100%	11


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	9.09%	1
2	No	90.91%	10
	Total	100%	11


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	9.09%	1
2	No	90.91%	10
	Total	100%	11

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	11.11%	1
2	No	88.89%	8
	Total	100%	9

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	9.09%	1
2	No	90.91%	10
	Total	100%	11

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	36.36%	4
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	63.64%	7
	Total	100%	11

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	4
	Total	100%	4

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	4
	Total	100%	4

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	4
	Total	100%	4

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	4
	Total	100%	4

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	4
	Total	100%	4


Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	4
	Total	100%	4

Action4Child Protection


Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	4
	Total	100%	4


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	5
	Total	100%	5

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	3
	Total	100%	3

Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	20.00%	1
2	No	80.00%	4
	Total	100%	5


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	9.09%	1
2	No	90.91%	10
	Total	100%	11

SER Communities Connected Data Report


Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75.00%	3
2	No	25.00%	1
	Total	100%	4


Action4Child Protection

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	1
2	No	75.00%	3
	Total	100%	4

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	1
2	No	75.00%	3
	Total	100%	4

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	1
2	No	75.00%	3
	Total	100%	4


Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	1
2	No	75.00%	3
	Total	100%	4




Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	1
2	No	75.00%	3
	Total	100%	4


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	1
2	No	75.00%	3
	Total	100%	4

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	4
	Total	100%	4


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	1
2	No	75.00%	3
	Total	100%	4

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	4
	Total	100%	4

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	25.00%	1
3	No	75.00%	3
	Total	100%	4


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	1
2	No	75.00%	3
	Total	100%	4


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	1
2	No	75.00%	3
	Total	100%	4

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	2
	Total	100%	2

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	1
2	No	75.00%	3
	Total	100%	4

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	1
2	No	0.00%	0
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	75.00%	3
	Total	100%	4

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1


Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1


Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Action4Child Protection


Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	1
	Total	100%	1

Action4Child Protection


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	1
2	No	75.00%	3
	Total	100%	4


Southern Region Data Report: CPI and CM

Region



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Southern	100.00%	25
	Total	100%	25

1. Present Danger Assessment



#	Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total
1	a.) Reviewer Judgement: Is the present danger assessment(s) sufficient to support the present danger decision?	68.00% 17	32.00% 8	0.00% 0	25
2	b.) Was present danger identified, at any point during the assessment by the CPI?	40.00% 10	60.00% 15	0.00% 0	25
3	c.) Reviewer Judgement: Determination of present danger decision was accurate by the CPI.	72.00% 18	12.00% 3	16.00% 4	25

Action4Child Protection


3. Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to present danger? Check all that apply. If present danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any present danger safety threats you believe existed in the case.



Action 4 Child Protection


#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child or the caregiver intended to seriously injure the child.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
2	Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained, or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions seriously endanger a child's physical health.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and /or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian is unwilling or unable to manage.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
7	Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	52.94%	9	47.06%	8	17
8	Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food clothing and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	3	50.00%	3	6
9	Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0

4. Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	10
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	10

6. Reviewer judgment: Was the present danger safety plan sufficient to control the present danger threats identified?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	80.00%	8
2	No	20.00%	2
	Total	100%	10


This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of i... - Sufficient Information



#	Question	Yes		No		Total
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	72.00%	18	28.00%	7	25
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	56.00%	14	44.00%	11	25
3	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	48.00%	12	52.00%	13	25
4	e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).	32.00%	8	68.00%	17	25
5	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	44.00%	11	56.00%	14	25
6	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	40.00%	10	60.00%	15	25


Action4Child Protection

This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “YES” if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information	32.00%	8
2	No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.	68.00%	17
	Total	100%	25

Impending Danger



#	Question	Yes		No		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	52.00%	13	48.00%	12	0.00%	0	25
2	b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	48.00%	12	20.00%	5	32.00%	8	25

Action4Child Protection

Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to impending danger? Check all that apply. If impending danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any impending danger threats you believe exist in the case.



Action 4 Child Protection

#	Question	Reviewer Identified		Worker Identified		Total
1	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child, or the caregiver intended to seriously harm the child.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
2	Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
3	The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions endanger a child's physical health.	50.00%	2	50.00%	2	4
4	There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and/or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates serious harm.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
5	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
6	Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian/caregiver is unwilling or unable to manage.	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
7	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously in way that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	50.00%	10	50.00%	10	20
8	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food, clothing, and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	50.00%	4	50.00%	4	8
9	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
10	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
11	Other.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0


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

857

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


Action4Child Protection

Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	76.92%	10
2	No	23.08%	3
3	NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	13

Safety Decision




#	Question	Safe		Unsafe		Unable to Determine due to Insufficient Information in Case Record		Total
1	a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	48.00%	12	52.00%	13	0.00%	0	25
2	b.) Reviewer judgment	20.00%	5	48.00%	12	32.00%	8	25

Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	27%	3
2	No	73%	8
3	NA-Pre-commencement not required per CFOP.	0%	14
	Total	100%	25


Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	25
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	25

Action4Child Protection


Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with the CPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently when indicated by the case dynamics. This would include the supervisor requesting and conducting a second tier consultation if needed and completing follow-up consultations as indicated.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	32.00%	8
2	No	68.00%	17
	Total	100%	25


Action4Child Protection

Supervisor case consultation notes indicate that the supervisor was providing coaching and mentoring to the CPI to ensure accurate and timely safety decisions are achieved.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	24.00%	6
2	No	76.00%	19
	Total	100%	25

Does the case transfer to case management due to an unsafe child, as determined by the CPI safety decision?




#	Answer	%	Count
4	Yes	52.00%	13
5	No	48.00%	12
	Total	100%	25

1. Safety Plan:




#	Question	No		Yes, In-Home Safety Plan		Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information		Total
1	a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	0.00%	0	15.38%	2	84.62%	11	0.00%	0	13
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	0.00%	0	7.69%	1	76.92%	10	15.38%	2	13

2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	53.85%	7
2	No	30.77%	4
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	15.38%	2
	Total	100%	13

3. Safety Plan: Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	53.85%	7
2	No	30.77%	4
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	15.38%	2
	Total	100%	13


4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented when met.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	45.45%	5
2	No	27.27%	3
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	27.27%	3
	Total	100%	11

Action4Child Protection


Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	38.46%	5
2	No	61.54%	8
	Total	100%	13


Action4Child Protection

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	53.85%	7
2	No	46.15%	6
	Total	100%	13

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	30.77%	4
2	No	69.23%	9
	Total	100%	13

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	38.46%	5
2	No	61.54%	8
	Total	100%	13


Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	46.15%	6
2	No	53.85%	7
	Total	100%	13




Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	38.46%	5
2	No	61.54%	8
	Total	100%	13




Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	53.85%	7
2	No	46.15%	6
	Total	100%	13

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	61.54%	8
2	No	38.46%	5
	Total	100%	13


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	7.69%	1
2	No	92.31%	12
	Total	100%	13

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	7.69%	1
2	No	92.31%	12
	Total	100%	13

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	46.15%	6
3	No	53.85%	7
	Total	100%	13


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	23.08%	3
2	No	76.92%	10
	Total	100%	13


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	30.77%	4
2	No	69.23%	9
	Total	100%	13

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	45.45%	5
2	No	54.55%	6
	Total	100%	11

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	69.23%	9
2	No	30.77%	4
	Total	100%	13

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	75%	2
2	No	25%	1
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	0%	10
	Total	100%	13

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2


Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2


Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2


Action4Child Protection

Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2


Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	38.46%	5
2	No	61.54%	8
	Total	100%	13


Southern Region Our Kids Data Report

Case documentation indicates that the CM began the Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment with a process of family engagement to establish rapport and to assure family understanding of why their child(ren) were determined to be unsafe.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	38.46%	5
2	No	61.54%	8
	Total	100%	13

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to child functioning sufficient to evaluate child strengths and needs and an overall in-depth understanding of the child(ren)?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	53.85%	7
2	No	46.15%	6
	Total	100%	13

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to adult functioning sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of each adult caregiver?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	30.77%	4
2	No	69.23%	9
	Total	100%	13

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of general parenting?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	38.46%	5
2	No	61.54%	8
	Total	100%	13

Is information in the ongoing family functioning assessment related to parenting discipline/behavior sufficient to evaluate caregiver protective capacities and an overall in-depth understanding of parenting discipline/behavior management?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	46.15%	6
2	No	53.85%	7
	Total	100%	13

Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	38.46%	5
2	No	61.54%	8
	Total	100%	13


Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	53.85%	7
2	No	46.15%	6
	Total	100%	13

Action4Child Protection


The danger statement is supported and aligned with the identified impending danger threats. Based upon the danger threat, it is clear how danger is manifesting within the family and evidence of utilization of the impending danger threshold criteria is noted within the danger statement.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	61.54%	8
2	No	38.46%	5
	Total	100%	13


Action4Child Protection

The family change strategy, including family goal, identified barriers, and strengths are supported by the ongoing family functioning assessment and the family change strategy indicates that the strategy was developed with the family.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	7.69%	1
2	No	92.31%	12
	Total	100%	13

Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	7.69%	1
2	No	92.31%	12
	Total	100%	13

Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?



#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	46.15%	6
3	No	53.85%	7
	Total	100%	13


Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	23.08%	3
2	No	76.92%	10
	Total	100%	13


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	30.77%	4
2	No	69.23%	9
	Total	100%	13

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	45.45%	5
2	No	54.55%	6
	Total	100%	11

Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	69.23%	9
2	No	30.77%	4
	Total	100%	13

Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	15.38%	2
2	No	7.69%	1
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	76.92%	10
	Total	100%	13

Does the information documented in the Family Assessment Areas of the Progress Update reflect current information related to Maltreatment, Adult Functioning, Child Functioning, and Parenting? (Answer based upon first Progress Update)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Does the safety summary and planning reflect the child's safety status as supported by identification of impending danger and status of caregiver protective capacities?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2


Is the decision related to next steps supported by the Progress Update and overall case documentation? (No changes needed changes in case plan needed or case closure recommended)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2


Action4Child Protection

The current safety plan is being actively managed by the CM through contact, monitoring, and active case management to ensure the sufficiency of the safety plan? This includes assessment of the parents home for assessment of conditions for return, discussion with parents regarding conditions for return and inclusion of information in progress evaluations.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	1
2	No	50.00%	1
	Total	100%	2

Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Changes to the safety plan and/or conditions for return were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	2
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	2

Is there evidence the case management supervisor is regularly consulting with the case manager, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	38.46%	5
2	No	61.54%	8
	Total	100%	13