


2017 SunCoast Region Report

OCW June 2017 Fidelity Review

June 28th 2017, 9:26 am MDT

Region - Region



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Central Region	16.99%	26
2	Northwest Region	16.34%	25
3	Northeast Region	16.99%	26
4	Southern Region	17.65%	27
5	Southeast Region	15.69%	24
6	Suncoast Region	16.34%	25
	Total	100%	153

Q287 - Circuit:

Circuit:

4
10
18
6
18
20
13
20
12
5
12
10
12
1
1
1
2
10
10
15
15
5
5
18
18
4
4

6

11

11

11

4

15

11

11

4

15

4

14

13

4

17

17

17

17

17

15

15

4

1

11

15

16

16

16

16

16

16

11

11

11

1

11

13

20

20

20

12

13

9

15

1

4

18

18

9

2

18

18

3

11

11

11

2

4

11

12

9

12

12

12

20

9

20

30

14

14

4

3

9

3

15

15

3

11

11

4

3

10

15

9

15

15

15

7

11

11

11

20

20

11

15

15

15

15

15

15

9

10

14

9

9

14

14

1

1

2

14

1

2

1

4

4

3

1

1

1

1

7

4

4

12

4

Q288 - County:

County:

- _____ Duval
- _____ Hardee
- _____ Brevard
- _____ Pinellas
- _____ Brevard
- _____ Collier
- _____ Hillsborough
- _____ Lee
- _____ Hillsborough
- _____ Lake
- _____ Desoto
- _____ Highlands
- _____ Suncoast
- _____ Okaloosa
- _____ Santa Rosa
- _____ Walton
- _____ Leon
- _____ Polk
- _____ Polk
- _____ Palm Beach
- _____ Palm Beach
- _____ Lake
- _____ Marion
- _____ Seminole
- _____ Seminole
- _____ Duval
- _____ Duval

Pasco

Miami-Dade

Miami-Dade

Miami-Dade

Duval

Palm Beach

Miami-Dade

Miami-Dade

Duval

Palm Beach

Duval

Bay

Hillsborough

Duval

Broward

Broward

Broward

Broward

Broward

Palm Beach

Palm Beach

Duval

Okaloosa

Miami-Dade

Palm Beach

Monroe

Monroe

Monroe

Monroe

Monroe

Monroe

Miami-Dade

Miami-Dade

Miami-Dade

Escambia

Miami-Dade

Hillsborough

Charlotte

Collier

Collier

Manatee

Hillsborough

Osceola

Palm Beach

Santa Rosa

Duval

Brevard

Seminole

Orange

Leon

Seminole

Brevard

Suwannee

Miami-Dade

Miami-Dade

Miami-Dade

Leon

Duval

Miami-Dade

Manatee

Orange

Manatee

Manatee

Manatee

Lee

Orange

Lee

Hendry

Bay

Bay

Duval

Madison

Orange

Swanee

Palm Beach

Palm Beach

Columbia

Miami-Dade

Miami-Dade

Duval

Columbia

Polk

Palm Beach

Orange

Palm Beach

Palm Beach

Palm Beach

Volusia

Miami-Dade

Miami-Dade

Miami-Adde

Collier

Hendry

Miami-Dade

Palm Beach

Palm Beach

Palm Beach

Palm Beach

Palm Beach

Palm Beach

Orange

Polk

Bay

Osceola

Orange

Bay

Bay

Okaloosa

Santa Rosa

Leon

Jackson

Santa Rosa

Franklin

Okaloosa

Duval

Nassau

Suwannee

Santa Rosa

Escambia

Escambia

Santa Rosa

Volusia

Duval

Duval

Manatee

Duval

Q291 - Supervisor:

Supervisor:

Adrienne Relaford

Ervin Bodiford

Susan Cameron

Sarah Pierce

Cheryl Christie

Alicia Holligan

Pamela Calwhite

Brock Smutney, Acting

Tasha Cousins

Emil Somersall

Nicole Allen

Ervin Bodiford

Erica Kleinfeld

Yari Mesa

JACQUILYN HENRY

Michele Carroll

Lori Fewell

Aram Perry

Aram Perry

Michelle Wolf

Michelle Wolf

Andrea Nicholson

Erika Summerfield

Suzanne Pelo

Kaydene Annakie

Derek McKibben

Richard Stephens-Reid

Amanda Losby

Maurice Brooks

Lara Leifermann

Eunice Guillot

Curtis Miller

Keon Dawkins

Angela Stephens

Chauncett Howard

Latoya Walker

Leigh Fitzpatrick

Melanie Maple

Victoria Maines

Jaclyn Short

Christopher Holder

Sara Roffe

Wilmine Merilan-Louis

Katina Lawson

Joseph Paduano

Miama Pinkney

Candace Cabey

Candace Cabey

Richard Stephens-Reid

Yari Mesa

Lakesha Wilson

Karshna Richard

Marty Sokolosky

Marty Sokolosky

Teresa Glover

Marty Sokolosky

Sebastian Rivera

Teresa Glover

Meloni Fincher

Valerie Payton

William Donzell

Abel Thompson

Eunice Guillot

Jaclyn Hazelzet

David Gervais

Kristen Kessler

Alicia Holligan

Linda Smith

Dennis Acosta

Robert Nichols

Amanda Voice

Melissa Bowles

Jennifer Waddy

Heather Terrell

Nancy Lowtan

Brittany Gagnon & Anastacia Dixon

Pamela Hester

Stephanie Hayden

Susan Cameron

Julia Johnson

Angela Stephens

Brian Frobel

Angela Stephens

Pamela Hester

Crystal Tyler

Eunice Guilott

Beth Hassen

LaJoyce Stout

Beth Hassen

Beth Hassan

Beth Hassan

Algee Johnson

Britney Gagnon

David Hernandez

Terence Thomas

Sandi Behrens

Kristi Walters

Adrienne Relaford

Tina Harkness

Destine Cajuste

Julia Johnson

Keon Dawkins

Theresa White

Xavier White

Donzell Williams

Anthony Benson

Crystal Tyler

Xaviera White

David Young

Candace Cabey

Shannon Sedlack

Lindsey McCrudden

Keon Dawkins

Theresa White

Eunice Cruz

Mara Salinas

Mara Salinas

Anthony Benson

Ryan Lukosavich

Terence Thomas

Theresa Luquis-Hernandez

Tiffany Crawford

Isis Williams

Leigh Fitzpatrick

Jennifer Strauss

Nadine Sindelar

Michelle Wolf

Sarah Lawrence

Andrew Sharp

Michael Guilfoyle

Rosa Ortiz

Anastacia Dixon

Kristi Walters

Kathleen Graminski

Charlottel Howell

Jacquilyn Henry

Demetra Brown

Jerry Corley

Melissa Bowles

Lori Fewell

Yari Mesa

Lindsey Rickards

Melinda Bartelt

Julia Johnson

Athena Wiggins

Tonja Odom

Jennifer Krumbein

Lisa Howie-Rigby

Sara Strock


Regina Jackson

Christopher Holder

Linda Smith

Crystal Tyler

QID136 - 1. Present Danger Assessment



#	Question	Yes		No		Cannot Determine	
1	a.) Did the worker identify present danger at any point in the investigation process?	50.72%	35	56.46%	118	0.00%	0
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was there information to indicate present danger in this case?	49.28%	34	43.54%	91	100.00%	27
	Total	Total	69	Total	209	Total	27


QID137 - 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.



#	Question	Reviewer Identified	Worker Identified
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.	4.17% 2	4.76% 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	2.38% 1


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.	8.33%	4	9.52%	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 harm.	2.08%	1	0.00%	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.	4.17%	2	2.38%	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 is unwilling or unable to manage.	2.08%	1	0.00%	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.	52.08%	25	52.38%	22
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.	27.08%	13	28.57%	12
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
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
11	Other	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
	Total	Total	48	Total	42

QID174 - 4. Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	94.29%	33
2	No	5.71%	2
	Total	100%	35

QID140 - 6. Reviewer judgment: Was the present danger safety plan sufficient to control the present danger threats identified?



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	63.64%	21
2	No	36.36%	12
	Total	100%	33


Q211 - This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of information collection. Reviewers should be evaluating the information in the FFA in regards to the sufficiency criteria for each domain. Reviewer should select “YES” if information is clearly documented and sufficient for decision making within the Family Functioning Assessment . Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but not sufficient” if the concepts are noted in the Family Functioning Assessment but the information is not sufficient to support decision making. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” if the worker did not include the concepts in the Family Functioning Assessment. This decision is based upon the review of the Family Functioning Assessment as recorded in FSFN by the CPI. Case notes are reviewed, however reviewer determination is based solely on FFA completed. Feedback notes should indicate if the case record either negated or supported decision making not otherwise reflected in the FFA.



#	Question	YES, Information is Sufficient		NO, Information is present but not sufficient		NO, Information is not present	
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	18.76%	97	13.96%	49	13.64%	6
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	17.41%	90	16.24%	57	11.36%	5
6	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	17.21%	89	16.52%	58	11.36%	5
5	e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis?)	13.93%	72	20.80%	73	15.91%	7

	Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).						
4	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	15.28%	79	18.23%	64	20.45%	9
3	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	17.41%	90	14.25%	50	27.27%	12
	Total	Total	517	Total	351	Total	44

QID191 - 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	50.66%	77
2	No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.	32.89%	50
3	No, Information is not present to assess the Caregiver Protective Capacities.	16.45%	25
	Total	100%	152

QID151 - Impending Danger



#	Question	Yes		No		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	
1	a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	50.77%	33	62.23%	117	3.92%	2
2	b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	49.23%	32	37.77%	71	96.08%	49
	Total	Total	65	Total	188	Total	51


QID185 - 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.



#	Question	Reviewer Identified	Worker Identified
2	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.	4.35%	3.77%
3	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%	1.89%


4	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.	8.70%	4	11.32%	6
17	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.	2.17%	1	0.00%	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.	4.35%	2	5.66%	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.	2.17%	1	3.77%	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%	23	47.17%	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.	28.26%	13	22.64%	12
9	Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0.00%	0	1.89%	1
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	1.89%	1
12	Other.	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
	Total	Total	46	Total	53

QID38 - 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	44.74%	17
2	No	55.26%	21
3	NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	38

QID175 - Safety Decision




#	Question	Safe		Safe: Impending Danger Being Managed by Protective Parent/Legal Guardian		Unsafe		Cannot determine	
1	a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	62.43%	118	0.00%	0	54.10%	33	1.89%	1
2	b.) Reviewer judgment	37.57%	71	0.00%	0	45.90%	28	98.11%	52
	Total	Total	189	Total	0	Total	61	Total	53

Q279 - Did the CPIS conduct a pre-commencement consultation with the CPI as needed based upon CFOP if applicable?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	18.54%	28
2	No	37.75%	57
3	NA-Precommencement not required per CFOP.	43.71%	66
	Total	100%	151

Q292 - Did the CPIS conduct an initial case consultation, as required by CFOP?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	97.35%	147
2	No	2.65%	4
	Total	100%	151

Q293 - 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	50.99%	77
2	No	49.01%	74
	Total	100%	151

Q294 - 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	44.67%	67
2	No	55.33%	83
	Total	100%	150

Q286 - Reviewer: Does the family proceed to case management services due to an unsafe child or child that is safe with impending danger being managed?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	22.52%	34
2	No	77.48%	117
	Total	100%	151

QID163 - 1. Safety Plan:




#	Question	No		Yes, In-Home Safety Plan		Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan		Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	
1	a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	100.00%	2	66.67%	6	53.19%	25	0.00%	0
2	b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	0.00%	0	33.33%	3	46.81%	22	100.00%	8
	Total	Total	2	Total	9	Total	47	Total	8

QID193 - 2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	54.55%	18
2	No	30.30%	10
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	15.15%	5
	Total	100%	33

QID167 - 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	48.48%	16
2	No	27.27%	9
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	24.24%	8
	Total	100%	33

QID194 - 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.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	50.00%	13
2	No	34.62%	9
3	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	15.38%	4
	Total	100%	26

Q236 - 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	25.81%	8
2	No	74.19%	23
	Total	100%	31

Q238 - 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	40.00%	12
2	No	60.00%	18
	Total	100%	30

Q240 - 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	16.67%	5
2	No	83.33%	25
	Total	100%	30

Q242 - 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	16.67%	5
2	No	83.33%	25
	Total	100%	30

Q244 - 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	20.00%	6
2	No	80.00%	24
	Total	100%	30

Q246 - Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support the caregiver protective capacities.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	23.33%	7
2	No	76.67%	23
	Total	100%	30

Q248 - Ongoing Family Functioning Assessment contains sufficient information to support child's needs assessment.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	43.33%	13
2	No	56.67%	17
	Total	100%	30

Q250 - 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	40.00%	12
2	No	60.00%	18
	Total	100%	30

Q252 - 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%	4
2	No	86.67%	26
	Total	100%	30

Q254 - Case plan outcomes were developed in collaboration with the family?




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

Q256 - Case plan outcomes were SMART and information in the ongoing family functioning assessment supports the case plan outcomes?




#	Answer	%	Count
2	Yes	25.00%	7
3	No	75.00%	21
	Total	100%	28

Q258 - Supervisor conducted a case consultation prior to approving the case plan.




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	28.57%	8
2	No	71.43%	20
	Total	100%	28

Q230 - 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	46.67%	14
2	No	53.33%	16
	Total	100%	30

Q232 - Conditions for return were clearly identified and supported by the safety planning analysis?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	6
2	No	75.00%	18
	Total	100%	24

Q234 - Changes to the safety plan were made when indicated? (Answer yes if no changes to the safety plan were indicated)




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	76.67%	23
2	No	23.33%	7
	Total	100%	30

Q259 - Did the CM complete a Progress Update at a minimum every three months or at critical junctures?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	26.67%	8
2	No	23.33%	7
3	Not applicable, no critical junctures or less than 3 months	50.00%	15
	Total	100%	30

Q263 - 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	12.50%	1
2	No	87.50%	7
	Total	100%	8

Q265 - Do the Reason(s) for Ongoing Involvement reflect a current identification of impending danger threats and a current danger statement?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	12.50%	1
2	No	87.50%	7
	Total	100%	8

Q267 - Does the scaling of child needs reflect a current assessment of child strengths and needs supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	2
2	No	75.00%	6
	Total	100%	8

Q269 - Does the scaling of protective capacities reflect a current assessment of caregiver protective capacities supported by case documentation?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	25.00%	2
2	No	75.00%	6
	Total	100%	8

Q271 - 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	25.00%	2
2	No	75.00%	6
	Total	100%	8

Q273 - Does the Outcomes Evaluation section reflect Outcomes which are SMART and consistent with other elements of the Progress Update?




#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	37.50%	3
2	No	62.50%	5
	Total	100%	8

Q275 - 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	25.00%	2
2	No	75.00%	6
	Total	100%	8

Q277 - 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	26.67%	8
2	No	73.33%	22
	Total	100%	30

Q281 - Was a request for action completed on this case? This is for cases where there was a request for action by the reviewers due to concerns for immediate safety of the children on the case.



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	0.00%	0
2	No	100.00%	32
	Total	100%	32

Q282 - Summarize the request for action needed.

Summarize the request for action needed.