

SHERIFFS' CHILD PROTECTIVE INVESTIGATIONS

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT

JANUARY 31, 2003

*CONDUCTED BY THE BROWARD, MANATEE, PASCO, PINELLAS, AND SEMINOLE COUNTY
SHERIFFS' OFFICES
and
THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
Office of Family Safety*

Jerry Regier
Secretary



Jeb Bush
Governor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION _____	i
EVALUATION PLAN AND DESIGN _____	i
QUALITY PERFORMANCE REVIEW _____	i
OUTCOME MEASURES AND STANDARDS _____	ii
CONCLUSIONS _____	ii
QUALITY PERFORMANCE REVIEW	ii
OUTCOME MEASURES	iii
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	iii
RECOMMENDATIONS _____	iii
PROGRAM PERFORMANCE EVALUATION _____	1
HISTORY OF THE INVOLVEMENT OF SHERIFFS IN CHILD PROTECTIVE INVESTIGATIONS IN FLORIDA _____	1
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PLAN AND DESIGN _____	2
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION QUESTIONS.....	2
DEVELOPMENT OF THE EVALUATION DESIGN AND PLAN	2
SAMPLING METHODOLOGY AND SIZE	2
QUALITY PERFORMANCE _____	3
PEER REVIEW TEAMS.....	3
REVIEW INSTRUMENTS	3
CASE REVIEW.....	3
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	4
ASSESSING PERFORMANCE	4
OUTCOME MEASURES ATTAINMENT _____	4
MEASURES AND STANDARDS	4
SOURCES OF DATA AND ANALYSIS METHODS.....	4
FINDINGS _____	5
QUALITY PERFORMANCE.....	5
MANATEE COUNTY	6

Areas of Best Performance	6
PASCO COUNTY	7
Areas of Best Performance	7
SEMINOLE COUNTY.....	8
Areas of Best Performance	8
BROWARD COUNTY	9
Areas of Best Performance	9
PINELLAS COUNTY.....	10
Areas of Best Performance	10
OUTCOME MEASURES ATTAINMENT _____	10
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT _____	12
COST EFFICIENCY _____	13
CONCLUSIONS _____	13
RECOMMENDATIONS _____	14

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The 2000 Florida Legislature mandated that the Department of Children and Families submit an annual report on the performance of sheriffs' offices receiving general appropriations to provide child protective investigations. Requirements for the program performance evaluation report include the following:

- To address quality performance, outcome attainment, and cost efficiency;
- Be based upon criteria mutually agreed upon by the sheriffs and the department;
- Be conducted by a team of peer reviewers from the sheriffs' offices performing investigations and representatives from the department;
- Be delivered to the President of the Senate, Speaker of the House, and the Governor by January 31 of each year [s. 39.3065(3)(d), F.S.].

The evaluation report is a collaborative effort between sheriffs' staff of Broward, Manatee, Pasco, Pinellas, and Seminole counties, and the Department of Children and Families (DCF). The sheriffs' offices took the lead in coordinating the peer review, developing the review tool and preparing the peer review report. The department provided reviewers to participate in the site reviews. The department took the lead in development of the cost efficiency data as represented in this report.

EVALUATION PLAN AND DESIGN

The program performance evaluation questions for this evaluation were based upon language in s. 39.3065(3)(d), F.S. In summary, these questions are:

1. How does the quality of performance in child protective investigation comply with the requirements of Chapter 39, F.S., within the participating sheriffs' offices?
2. Have the sheriffs achieved the performance standards and outcomes specified in their grant agreements, as required by the General Appropriations Act and s. 39.3065(3)(b), F.S.?
3. Are the sheriffs performing child protective investigations cost efficiently?

Representatives from the sheriffs' offices and the department composed the program evaluation planning team.

QUALITY PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The methodology for the quality performance component of the evaluation called for a review of case records. A statistically reliable, randomly selected sample of all initial

child maltreatment cases received after April 1, 2002 and locked between July 1, 2002, through the extract date of the sample for the five sheriffs' offices was used. The sample sizes selected were designed to yield results with an error of no more than plus or minus ten percent with a confidence level of 90 percent.

The program performance evaluation was conducted by a team of peer reviewers composed of representatives from the sheriffs' offices and the department. The approach to the peer review proposed by the department and accepted by the sheriffs' representatives is one in use for several years by the department's Quality Assurance Unit. The reviews of the sheriffs' offices occurred from October 2nd, through November 1st, 2002.

The instruments included evaluation tools for the combined areas of initial response, emergency removal and placement, and program management. Also agreed upon were sampling methodology and instrument scoring procedures.

OUTCOME MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Paragraph 39.3065(3)(b), F.S., requires that the sheriffs operate, at a minimum, in accordance with the performance standards and outcome measures established by the Legislature for protective investigations conducted by the department. Three performance measures from the General Appropriations Act for the fiscal years 2000-01 and 2001-02 apply to child protective investigations and are referenced in the grant agreements with the sheriffs. The performance measures and standards used to determine outcome attainment for the sheriffs and the comparison counties are the following:

1. One hundred percent (100%) of cases completed within 60 days.
2. One hundred percent (100%) of cases commenced within 24 hours.
3. One hundred percent (100%) of cases reviewed by supervisors in accordance with department timeframes for the early warning system.

The data for the first two measures come from routine management reports produced by the department's Family Safety Program Office data unit and taken from the database of the Florida Abuse Hotline Information System. The third measure (supervisory review) is not available from current automated information systems on a statewide basis and, therefore cannot be reported.

CONCLUSIONS

QUALITY PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The results of the quality performance reviews demonstrate that the sheriffs' offices continue to meet or exceed satisfactory performance ratings on the quality of protective investigations. The respective reviews are also being used for future program enhancement, evaluation and planning.

OUTCOME MEASURES

Examining performance on outcome measures shows conclusive results. All participating sheriffs' office programs achieved the mandated standard for performance on all outcomes. There were no significant differences between the participating sheriffs' office programs with regard to protective investigations.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

All participating sheriff's office programs achieved a passing rating in program management.

Based on this review, it is apparent that the sheriffs' offices currently conducting child protective investigations in Florida are successfully performing child protective investigations. These participating sheriffs' office programs have established themselves as proven models for providing child protective investigations into the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Department of Children and Families should continue to contract with the sheriffs' offices in Manatee, Pasco, Seminole, Broward and Pinellas counties to conduct child protective investigations.
2. The Legislature should continue to recognize the sheriffs' office models as a viable method of providing child protective investigative services and discontinue the requirement for annual reports to the Legislature on their progress for these established organizations. Any new organization should be required to participate in a peer review process during its first three years to demonstrate they are satisfactorily performing child protective investigations.
3. The Department of Children and Families should continue to monitor its grants with sheriffs' offices and their quality of performance.
4. The Department of Children and Families should continue to report on the sheriffs' progress in achieving the legislatively mandated performance measures and targets.
5. The Department of Children and Families, with the collaboration of the participating sheriffs' offices, should continue to identify appropriate practice standards and performance measures and recommended legislative changes for child protective investigations.
6. The Department of Children and Families should use the results of this year's quality performance review to identify and implement improvements for pre-service and in-service training of investigators and supervisors.

INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The 2000 Florida Legislature mandated that the Department of Children and Families submit an annual report on the performance of sheriffs' offices receiving general appropriations to provide child protective investigations. Requirements for the program performance evaluation report include the following:

- To address quality performance, outcome attainment, and cost efficiency;
- Be based upon criteria mutually agreed upon by the sheriffs and the department;
- Be conducted by a team of peer reviewers from the sheriffs' offices performing investigations and representatives from the department; and
- Be delivered to the President of the Senate, Speaker of the House, and the Governor by January 31 of each year [s. 39.3065(3)(d), F.S.].

The report that follows is a collaborative effort between the staffs of the sheriffs of Broward, Manatee, Pasco, Pinellas, and Seminole counties and the Department of Children and Families. At the time of the performance reviews, the sheriffs' offices had assumed child protective investigations for the following lengths of time:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| ▪ Manatee Sheriff's Office | Five years 11 months |
| ▪ Pinellas Sheriff's Office | Three years |
| ▪ Broward Sheriff's Office | Three years 3 months |
| ▪ Pasco Sheriff's Office | Two years 8 months |
| ▪ Seminole Sheriff's Office | One year and 7 months |



HISTORY OF THE INVOLVEMENT OF SHERIFFS IN CHILD PROTECTIVE INVESTIGATIONS IN FLORIDA

The Manatee County Sheriff's Office began conducting investigations of more serious cases of child maltreatment in February 1997, under legislation passed in 1993. This legislation allowed the department to enter into agreements, within existing resources, with county sheriffs' offices or local police departments to assume the lead in conducting criminal investigations of child maltreatment, as well as partial or full responsibility for conducting certain components of child protective investigations.

Legislation passed during the 1998 legislative session required the department to transfer the responsibility for all child protective investigations in Manatee, Pasco, and

Pinellas counties to the sheriffs' offices by July 1999. The legislation permits the sheriff to subcontract with other law enforcement officials or private agencies to conduct investigations of child neglect cases. The 1999 Legislature added the Broward County Sheriff's Office to those sheriffs authorized to conduct child protective investigations.

During the 2000 legislative session, child protective investigations in Seminole County were transferred to the sheriffs' office beginning in fiscal year 2000-01. The Legislature also authorized the department to enter into grant agreements with other sheriffs to perform child protective investigations in their respective counties [s. 39.3065(3)(d), F.S.].

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PLAN AND DESIGN

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The program performance evaluation questions for this evaluation were based upon language in s. 39.3065(3)(d), F.S. In summary, these questions are:

1. How does the quality of performance in child protective investigation comply with the requirements of Chapter 39, F.S., within the participating sheriffs' offices?
2. Have the sheriffs achieved the performance standards and outcomes specified in their grant agreements, as required by the General Appropriations Act and s. 39.3065(3)(b), F.S.? How does outcome attainment compare between the sheriffs and the department?
3. Are the sheriffs performing child protective investigations cost efficiently?

DEVELOPMENT OF THE EVALUATION DESIGN AND PLAN

Representatives from the department and all participating sheriffs' offices agreed to the instruments used in the peer review during the summer of 2002. The instruments included evaluation tools for the functional areas of initial response combined with emergency removal and program management. Also agreed upon were sampling methodology and instrument scoring procedures.

SAMPLING METHODOLOGY AND SIZE

The methodology for the quality performance component of the evaluation called for a review of case records. A statistically reliable, randomly-selected sample of all initial child maltreatment cases received after April 1, 2002 and locked between July 1, 2002, through the extract date of the samples (October 1st, 2002 through November 1st, 2002) was drawn for the five sheriffs' offices. Extending the sampling period as close to the review date as possible was necessary to ensure that each sheriff's office had a sufficient number of cases referred, investigated, and locked from which to draw a reliable sample. The definition of a locked report, as used in this performance evaluation, is an investigation that has been completed, reviewed, signed by the investigator and supervisor, and closed in the Florida Abuse Hotline Information System.

The sample sizes selected were designed to yield results with an error of no more than plus or minus ten percent with a confidence level of 90 percent. (The confidence level and error rate selected means that if 100 samples of the selected sample size were drawn from the total population of cases in an agency, in 90 of these samples the sample mean will be within ten percent of the population mean). The samples were randomly drawn from the Florida Abuse Hotline Information System database 30 days before each review.

QUALITY PERFORMANCE

PEER REVIEW TEAMS

Paragraph 39.3065(3)(d), F.S., requires that the program performance evaluation be conducted by a team of peer reviewers composed of representatives from the sheriffs' offices and the department. The approach to the peer review proposed by the department and accepted by the sheriffs' representatives is one in use for several years by the Quality Assurance Unit for child protective services. The case review instruments used by the Quality Assurance Unit were modified for this evaluation and included a program management instrument. The peer review process used by the Quality Assurance Unit is based upon similar procedures used by national accreditation organizations.

The definition of peer, as used in this performance evaluation, means sheriffs and department personnel who perform protective investigations and their respective quality assurance personnel, where applicable. The criteria established for peer reviewers included experience in child protective investigations; certification or, minimally, completion of child protective investigative training; supervisory level staff or above, or a staff member of the department's Quality Assurance Unit. Peer review teams consisted of seven participants at each site included a representative of each participating sheriff's offices and three Department of Children and Families representatives.

The quality performance peer review teams were organized to reflect equal membership between the review parties, including a designated sheriff's office lead.

REVIEW INSTRUMENTS

Case review

Peer reviewers assessed case files individually, onsite, using case review instruments modified for this evaluation by representatives of the department and the respective sheriffs' offices. The case review instruments address the statutory requirements for the investigator's initial response to the report of alleged child maltreatment and the emergency removal and placement of children, if this occurred. The instruments contain a number of statements or questions that address indicators used to determine how well essential steps in the investigation have been achieved. Indicators cover such areas as thoroughness of background checks, timeliness of investigations, and thoroughness of child safety assessments.

Program Management

Representatives from the Peer Review Team rated each sheriff's office for program management based on an instrument that was developed by all agencies. Each program was rated according to how effectively the program was implemented and directed.

ASSESSING PERFORMANCE

Each team member determined the performance rating on each indicator. Overall performance was then based upon the sum of the indicator scores divided by the maximum possible score to produce a percentage. Using the performance categories, the derived percentages translate into the following performance levels:

- Passing
- Non-Passing

(The overall final performance rating is based upon the value of 2/3 case file review and 1/3 value of the program management review. The descriptive ratings of Passing and Non-passing will be used as described as above.)

OUTCOME MEASURES ATTAINMENT

MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Paragraph 39.3065(3)(b), F.S., requires that the sheriffs operate, at a minimum, in accordance with the performance standards and outcome measures established by the Legislature for protective investigations conducted by the department. Three performance measures from the General Appropriations Act for the fiscal years 2000-01 and 2001-02 apply to child protective investigations. The performance measures and standards used to determine outcome attainment for the sheriffs and the comparison counties for fiscal year 2001-2002 follow:

1. One hundred percent (100%) of cases completed within 60 days.
2. One hundred percent (100%) of cases commenced within 24 hours.
3. One hundred percent (100%) of cases reviewed by supervisors in accordance with department timeframes for the early warning system.

SOURCES OF DATA AND ANALYSIS METHODS

The data for the first two measures come from routine management reports produced by the data unit at the department's Family Safety Program Office from the Florida Abuse Hotline Information System database. These data reports specifically list each sheriff's office as a protective investigation program. A reporting period of April 1, 2002 through June 30, 2002 was selected for several reasons:

- The reporting period coincides with the sampling period for the quality performance review.
- The reporting period adjusts for the variance in implementation dates for the sheriff.
- The reporting period ensures a sufficient number of cases upon which to calculate outcome performance.

The third measure, supervisory review, is not available from current automated information systems on a statewide basis and, therefore, cannot be reported.

The algorithms for calculating the outcome measures are those established by the department in consultation with the Governor's Office of Policy and Budget as well as the substantive and appropriations committees of the Legislature having jurisdiction for the department and are the following:

- The first performance measure (cases closed within 60 days), the numerator is the number of child protective investigations received during the period where the investigation completed date is within 60 days of the received date. The denominator is the total number of child protective investigations received during the same period as the numerator.
- The second performance measure (cases commenced within 24 hours), the numerator is the number of cases commenced within 24 hours of receipt of the report. The denominator is the total number of cases received.

FINDINGS

QUALITY PERFORMANCE

Teams of peer reviewers from the department and the sheriffs' offices conducted the quality performance reviews from October 1, through November 1, 2002. A summary of the performance findings is presented in the table below. The true percentages, if all cases rather than samples had been used, can be assumed with confidence to fall somewhere within plus or minus ten percent at the 90 percent confidence level. Based upon the confidence level and estimated error rate established by the sampling methodology, there is no statistically significant difference between the sheriffs' offices in the quality of performing child protective investigations.

Peer Review Results

County	Initial Response/ Emergency Removal	Program Management	Overall Performance
Manatee	PASS	PASS	PASS
Pasco	PASS	PASS	PASS
Seminole	PASS	PASS	PASS
Broward	PASS	PASS	PASS
Pinellas	PASS	PASS	PASS



MANATEE COUNTY

Overall, the Manatee County Sheriff's Office received a **PASSING** performance rating. For the combined areas of initial response and emergency removal the Manatee County Sheriff's Office received a **PASSING** performance rating. For program management, a **PASSING** performance rating was achieved.

Summarized observations made by the review team on performance follow:

Areas of Best Performance:

- The Manatee County Sheriff's Office Child Protective Investigations units have a close working relationship with their Crimes Against Children Detective Unit, as well as with sheriff's office deputy personnel and supervision to effectively coordinate efforts in the community to ensure accurate and evidentiary investigative process. Once a case is determined to meet the criteria for detective call-out, it is immediately jointly responded to, by a Child Protection Specialist and a detective, to investigate. This joint response preserves the evidentiary process for criminal prosecution.
- The Manatee County Sheriff's Office implemented an internal Child Protection Investigation Division quality assurance tool to monitor victims seen/not seen, to ensure that child victims are seen in a timely manner, to further involve other law enforcement entities and sources to find children not found, and monitor case reviews and second party reviews.
- The co-location of the Manatee Sheriff's Office and the Partnership for Safe Children enables ease in collaboration for services and staffing needs. This close

working relationship also is conducive to better communications to ensure the families receive services and continue to follow up on them.

- Investigators consistently demonstrate the appropriate decision making and referrals for services as documented in the case files. Referrals are varied and specific to the financial and service needs of the family.
- Interviews of subjects in the reports as well as with the appropriate collateral contacts were thorough and well documented. Observations of both the home environment and family interactions were documented and photos included in many files to verify adverse or hazardous conditions. Case files are well marked and organized and include Florida Crime Information Center and local criminal checks on all persons in the home 12 years and older.
- There has been a consistent and continuing effort to reduce backlog and caseloads at the Manatee County Sheriff's Office, and supervisors work in a coordinated effort to track and target cases for immediate attention. Weekly statistical reports are reviewed and individual investigator caseloads are monitored for problems or corrective actions.
- Supervisory reviews reflect appropriate guidance and direction and are well documented in the case files. Unit supervisors review the cases for completion of the recommended follow-up by investigators, and timely entries are made in the case chronological notes.



PASCO COUNTY

Overall, the Pasco Sheriff's Office received a **PASSING** performance rating. For the combined areas of initial response and emergency removal the Pasco Sheriff's Office received a **PASSING** performance rating. For program management, a **PASSING** performance rating was achieved.

Summarized observations made by the review team on performance follow:

Areas of Best Performance:

- Appropriate guidance and direction was documented by the supervisor and followed through by the investigators. When the criteria were met for a second party review, they were completed in a timely manner by a law enforcement sergeant who acts in a district supervisor role at each service center.
- During this evaluation period, FY 2001-2002, the total backlog was reduced by approximately 2000 cases. Ongoing efforts continue with allocation of manpower and resources to further reduce and prevent backlog accumulation.
- Interviews with subjects of the reports were thorough and well documented. Most cases reviewed included additional observations such as family interact on and documentation of environmental conditions.

- Files reviewed showed a large number of referrals by the Child Protective Investigator to resource services in the community and follow up with those services to ensure compliance to avoid judicial involvement.
- Thorough background checks were found in well marked and organized files, to include local law enforcement, Florida Department of Law Enforcement and NCIC checks on all persons in the home 12 years and older.
- There is documentation of frequent communication and good working relationship with the Pasco County Sheriff's Office staff and personnel at the DCF Suncoast Regional Office.
- Investigators consistently demonstrated appropriate decision making and frequent internal staffings as evidenced in case files. Investigators were very resourceful in making referrals that met the presenting safety issues noted.



SEMINOLE COUNTY

Overall, the sheriff's office received a **PASSING** performance rating. For the combined areas of initial response and emergency removal the Seminole County Sheriff's Office received a **PASSING** performance rating. For program management, a **PASSING** performance rating was achieved

Summarized observations made by the review team on performance follow:

Areas of Best Performance:

- The Seminole County Sheriff's Office was one of the highest rated areas in the state for seeing victims timely, as their policy indicates that investigators are required to treat all cases as an immediate response.
- The files were found to be extremely well organized, through the use of type written notes and color coded labels to section the files.
- The Seminole County Sheriff's Office implemented a specialized service unit that provides coordination of all community service agencies and serves as a liaison between the child protective investigators and the patrol division.
- The sheriff's office analytical unit was noted to provide complete criminal and Florida Abuse Hotline Information System background information to the investigator prior to case commencement.
- Supervisory reviews were seen to be completed and well-documented in case files and on risk assessments.
- The case files were further enhanced by the presence of digital photographs that documented observations during the investigative process aiding in both verifying as well as refuting allegations.

- The sheriff's office was also noted to be proactive and innovative in their approach to backlog reduction, by showing evidence of constant supervisory monitoring and division-wide support through case "locking parties", to assist all investigators with case closure.



BROWARD COUNTY

Overall, the Broward County Sheriff's Office received a **PASSING** performance rating. For the combined areas of initial response and emergency removal the Broward County Sheriff's Office received a **PASSING** performance rating. For program management, a **PASSING** performance rating was achieved.

Summarized observations made by the review team on performance follow:

Areas of Best Performance:

- The Broward County Sheriff's Office utilizes an innovative management tool called *Powertrac*, which requires the child protective investigations' management staff to report every 12 weeks, in person, on all relevant performance indicators to senior management, including the sheriff.
- At the time of the peer review the Broward County Sheriff's Office accounted for 1.6% of the state's backlog despite the fact that this office handles over 8% of the state's total cases.
- Time frames for child safety assessments were routinely met. Adults, victims and children were interviewed in a timely manner.
- Use of services such as the Family Builders program has significantly increased under the sheriff. Investigators routinely made appropriate referrals for community based-services.
- Supervisors routinely reviewed cases within statutory time frames providing guidance and direction early in the investigation. In almost all cases, investigators followed up on supervisory guidance.
- Background checks were routinely completed early in the investigation. This allows the investigator to be well informed about the history of the family prior to responding to the investigation. The checks appeared to be thorough, consisting of vital statistic and civil court documents.
- In July of 2002, the Broward County Sheriff's Office agreed with the Department of Children and Families to be the first Beta test site for the implementation of the HomeSafenet Child Safety Assessment Beta. This presented an additional burden impacting on investigator productivity. Despite this additional burden this office continues to maintain a low backlog.



PINELLAS COUNTY

The Pinellas County Sheriff's Office received an overall **PASSING** performance rating. For the combined areas of initial response and emergency removal the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office received a **PASSING** performance rating. For program management, a **PASSING** performance rating was achieved.

Summarized observations by the quality performance review team follow:

Areas of Best Performance:

- The Pinellas County Sheriff's Office has been maintaining a low turnover rate.
- A fully developed "Field Training" mentoring program assures that all CPI trainees are evaluated, based on observable behaviors, and ensures trainees demonstrate proficiency before an incremental assignment of more cases per week occurs.
- An internal monitoring program is used to provide quality assurance, support and feedback to staff members.
- Contracted with a psychologist who serves as a consultant on complex cases.
- Utilize "I-Told" card system to ensure consistency when qualifying children during dependency investigations.
- Have employed two diligent search analysts for locating parents and other family members. This service is also provided to family continuity programs in Pasco County.
- On-site drug testing is conducted with clients. This system allows investigators to expeditiously address drug issues during dependency cases.

OUTCOME MEASURES ATTAINMENT

Outcome data below were from a June-September 2002 Florida Abuse Hotline Information System (FAHIS) database report. Supporting data presented in the tables below were derived from department management reports and are also based upon the FAHIS database.

Outcome 1: Percent of Cases Completed within 60 Days (April- June 2002)

County	Percent Completed
Manatee	39.8%
Pasco	42.1%
Seminole	67.9%
Broward	49.1%
Pinellas	68.4%
Statewide	42.6%

For all counties there was a low of 15% to a high of 83% percent of cases completed within 60 days for the month of June 2002.

**Ratio Cases Completed within 60 Days
(April – June 2002)**

County	Reports Open Greater than 60 Days Per Average New Reports Received During Prior three Months
Manatee	0.56
Pasco	5.08
Seminole	1.08
Broward	0.33
Pinellas	1.31

Backlogged cases, (those cases open for more than 60 days), are the inverse of completed cases and may result from a variety of factors: the number of vacant positions, the number of experienced investigators, the number of judicial cases, an increased number of reports and the rate of that increase.

**Outcome 2: Percent of Cases Commenced within 24 Hours
(April-June 2002)**

County	% Commenced within 24 hours
Manatee	95.0%
Pasco	98.2%
Seminole	99.3%
Broward	99.1%
Pinellas	99.4%
Statewide	98.1%

Examining the performance on outcome measures indicates a high level of achievement on the commencement of cases within 24 hours. Although no protective investigations unit statewide achieved the mandated standard of 100 percent, it can be argued that circumstances in the field may never permit 100 percent attainment.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Program Management Performances

County	Percent
Manatee	PASS
Pasco	PASS
Seminole	PASS
Broward	PASS
Pinellas	PASS

Each peer review site was evaluated on their level of performance for each of 24 specific program management criteria. These criteria addressed training, communications, transportation, backlog reduction, victim and perpetrator contacts, 24-hour operations, working agreements with law enforcement, internal management practices, operating procedures, agency goals and objectives, personnel standards, use of voluntary services and other relevant program management activities. Each site reviewed scored a passing performance rating in their ability to implement and direct their respective programs in a positive and cost efficient manner.

COST EFFICIENCY

As the cost information is reviewed, the following excerpt from the Senate Budget Committee Interim Project Report 2001-007, issued in November 2000, should be taken into consideration:

"This study found no documentation to suggest that the legislature mandated the transfer of child protection investigations to the sheriffs in order to save costs or achieve operational efficiencies. The stimulus for this legislative action appears to have been to test a different program model that might do a better job of protecting children from abuse and neglect."

In addition, there are several factors influencing the ability to prepare an accurate unit cost analysis. These factors include: sheriff agency preference as to purchasing motor vehicles versus leasing; varying organizational structures; status of each agency in terms of length of time and amount of experience in performing investigative functions; and costs included in some or none of the agencies. Costs not reflected in any unit cost calculation include those related to HomeSafenet and training costs paid directly by the Professional Development Center. Another factor is that each sheriff's grant is limited to reimbursement of actual expenditures incurred in one fiscal year. Therefore, costs for assets with a useful life of more than one year are not allocated across the benefiting periods. The result is an overstatement of cost in the year of purchase and an understatement of cost in the benefiting periods.

The following chart provides budget and cost data for each sheriff and the department for a two-year period. With the exception of Pinellas, it is evident that the costs can vary greatly from one fiscal year to the next for each agency. Seminole's unit cost decreases almost 15% in FY 2001/02. This is due primarily to the amount of nonrecurring costs incurred in their start up year (FY 2000/01). Actual costs being higher in FY 2001/02 over the previous year can be attributed to being successful in filling and retaining staff. Other causes for the variances are the same as the factors listed above.

AGENCY	FY 2001/2002 GRANT BUDGET	INITIAL AND ADDITIONAL REPORTS FOR FY 2001/2002	BUDGETED COST PER REPORT INVESTIGATED FY 2001/2002	ACTUAL COST PER REPORT INVESTIGATED FY 2001/2002	ACTUAL COST PER REPORT INVESTIGATED FY 2000/2001
Broward	\$10,673,738	14,565	\$732.83	\$726.53	\$686.39
Manatee	\$2,178,403	3,311	\$657.92	\$650.06	\$561.17
Pasco	\$3,187,607	4,711	\$676.63	\$660.72	\$497.92
Pinellas	\$7,551,721	10,353	\$729.42	\$728.47	\$720.77
Seminole	\$2,845,681	3,310	\$859.72	\$806.42	\$943.02
Sheriff Average	\$26,437,150	36,250	\$731.31	\$714.44	\$681.85
* Department	\$91,968,981	149,808	\$613.91	\$613.91	\$679.00 / 595.00

* The following columns containing department information include 15.8% indirect cost on the salary base: FY 2001/2002 Grant Budget; Budgeted Cost Per Report Investigated FY 2001/2002; and Actual Cost Per Report Investigated FY 2001/2002.

The amount for the department in the column "Actual Reported Cost Per Report Investigated FY 2000/01" includes 17.4% indirect cost on the salary base for a total report cost of \$595.00. The \$679.00 cost was calculated by Competitive Strategies, LLC. The methodology used by the consultant could not be replicated for FY 2001/2002.

CONCLUSIONS

Peer Review Results and Outcome Measures

County	Initial Response/ Emergency Removal	Program Management	Outcome #1 % Closed within 60 Days	Outcome #2 Commenced within 24 Hours
Manatee	PASS	PASS	39.8%	95%
Pasco	PASS	PASS	42.1%	98.2%
Seminole	PASS	PASS	67.9%	99.3%
Broward	PASS	PASS	49.1%	99.1%
Pinellas	PASS	PASS	68.4%	99.4%

Based on this review, it is apparent that the sheriffs' offices currently conducting child protective investigations in Florida are satisfactorily performing child protective investigations. These pilot projects have established themselves as proven models for providing child protective investigations into the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Department of Children and Families should continue to contract with the sheriffs' offices in Manatee, Pasco, Seminole, Broward and Pinellas counties to conduct child protective investigations.
2. This Legislature should continue to recognize the sheriffs' office models as a viable method of providing child protective investigative services and discontinue the requirement for annual reports to the Legislature on their progress for these established organizations. Any new organization should be required to participate in a peer review process during its first three years to demonstrate they are satisfactorily performing child protective investigations.
3. The Department of Children and Families should continue to monitor its grants with sheriffs' offices and their quality of performance.
4. The Department of Children and Families should continue to report on the sheriffs' progress in achieving the legislatively mandated performance measures and targets.
5. The Department of Children and Families, with the collaboration of the participating sheriffs' offices, should continue to identify appropriate practice standards and performance measures and recommended legislative changes for child protective investigations.
6. The Department of Children and Families should use the results of this year's quality performance review to identify and implement improvements for pre-service and in-service training of investigators and supervisors.