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1. Analysis of Investigative File Review Data

A. Summary of Cases Reviewed

A total of ten investigations were reviewed in the fourth quarter. A file was not reviewed from the Navarre unit as the unit was participating in a pilot program during this quarter. One case involved a removal. The most serious maltreatments of ten cases involved family violence. This report was Verified. One case was Verified for Substance misuse. One case had Not Substantiated findings for Threatened Harm. The remaining cases were all closed with no indicators for maltreatments such as Inadequate Supervision which involved five of the cases. One case was closed with no indicators of Physical Injury. Cases were open anywhere from 28-61 days. Three cases had no prior reports. Four cases had five or less prior reports. One case had 15 prior reports and one had 14 prior reports.

B. Overall Performance in Achieving Safety

Each standard is assigned a score of 9-Achieved, 7-Mostly Achieved, 5-Partially Achieved, 0-Not Achieved, or NA-Not Applicable. Scoring is based on the percentage of standards that are Achieved, Mostly Achieved, Partially Achieved, or Not Achieved. Not Applicable ratings are not considered in determining the overall level of compliance.

Circuit 1 received a score of 87% for the 28 standards related to the Investigative Response Domain. There was one removal case selected from the random sample from the fourth quarter. Circuit 1 received a score of 76% for the standards related to the Emergency Response Domain.

Circuit 1 received an overall score of 87% for the fourth quarter.
*Please note the scoring methodology has changed since the first and second quarter reviews. The total score reflected for each standard as well as the overall scores are calculated by adding the total score received divided by the total possible score.

Attachment 1 reflects the overall results for each standard as well as trends discussed in C through F in the remainder of this report.

C. Conducting thorough Assessments

The following standards consider whether assessments were completed throughout the investigative process to include the development of realistic safety plans when needed. **An overall score of 90% was received for Conducting thorough Assessments.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEW STANDARD</th>
<th>Achieved (9)</th>
<th>Mostly Achieved (7)</th>
<th>Partially Achieved (5)</th>
<th>Not Achieved (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Background checks completed timely and used to assess risk</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Safety assessment process</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Relevant collateral contacts</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Obtaining pertinent information from collaterals</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. CLS staffing held when warranted and a petition was filed when legally sufficient</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Upon removal, a determination regarding ICWA was made</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Upon removal, background checks and a home inspection were completed prior to placement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of Excellence were noted in the following standards relating to Conducting thorough Assessments:
• Required background checks were completed timely and the information was appropriately used to assess immediate safety and short/long term risks to each child and the need for services. **96% of all applicable cases.**

• Relevant collateral contacts were completed during the course of the investigation. **96% of all applicable cases.**

• Pertinent information was obtained from the collateral contacts and was appropriately considered when assessing the overall safety of the child and/or need for services. **96% of all applicable cases.**

Opportunities for Improvement were noted in the following standard relating to Conducting thorough Assessments:

• The safety assessment process was completed with sufficient thoroughness to identify risks and develop a safety plan if needed. **80% of all applicable cases.**

  In one case it appears the safety assessment was completed with all unknowns to meet the timeframe. It was completed by someone other than the commencing CPI. Another case needed more detailed information in the CSA. There was one case where the criminal history was not assessed in the initial safety assessment.

• The CPI presented the case to CLS for a staffing when warranted and when the investigation was legally sufficient, a petition was filed or a valid reason for not filing a petition was documented. **75% of one applicable case.**

  In one case it was unclear if the family was still open to FFN. A staffing was needed with CLS and FFN to determine the status of the case as well as to assess for any needed services.

• Upon removing a child from his/her home, the CPI made the appropriate inquires to determine if the child was of American Indian or Native Alaskan descent so that the appropriate tribe could be contacted regarding the need for an alternative placement. **78% of one applicable case.**

  There was one removal case. The notes reflect the mother was asked about ICWA information. There was no documentation the father was asked about ICWA information for his side of the family.
C. Observing and Interviewing Children, Parents, Others

The following standards consider whether thorough interviews with children and other participants were conducted and substantive observations were made of behaviors and interactions between the children and family members. **An overall score of 85% was received for Observing and Interviewing Children, Parents, and Others.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEW STANDARD</th>
<th>Achieved (9)</th>
<th>Mostly Achieved (7)</th>
<th>Partially Achieved (5)</th>
<th>Not Achieved (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Diligent attempts to see the victim were made at least daily if the victim was not seen within 24 hours</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interviews with children</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interviews with parents &amp; caregivers</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Relevant observations and interactions of children</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunities for improvement were noted in the following standard relating to Observing and Interviewing Children, Parents, and Others:

- Diligent attempts to see the child victim were made at least daily if the child victim was not seen immediately or within 24 hours of report receipt from the Florida Abuse Hotline. If the initial attempt to contact the child victim was unsuccessful, regular daily attempts were documented at varying locations and at varying times of day. **78% of all applicable cases.**

In one case the victim was sent out of state to the hospital and was not seen within 24 hours nor was a request made to see the child until the next business day which was outside the 24 hour timeframe.

- An interview was conducted and addressed all maltreatments with the alleged child victim(s) and other child(ren) named in the report and/or residing in the home. **83% of all applicable cases.**

Not all victims and other children in the home were interviewed in two cases.
D. Determining Maltreatment Findings, Family Needs and Services

The following standards consider whether appropriate maltreatment findings were reached and needed services were provided to children and families to promote positive outcomes and improve child-well-being. **An overall score of 91% was received for Determining Maltreatment Findings, Family Needs, and Services.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEW STANDARD</th>
<th>Achieved (9)</th>
<th>Mostly Achieved (7)</th>
<th>Partially Achieved (5)</th>
<th>Not Achieved (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. CPI worked with CPT to determine findings and service needs.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Maltreatment findings supported by evidence</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. CPI completed an ESI to determine if family preservation services could prevent removal.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Service needs were identified</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Referrals were made for identified services.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Service engagement.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Prior to removal, CPI made efforts to provide services to allow the child to remain in the home.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of excellence were noted in the following standards relating to Determining Maltreatment Findings, Family Needs, and Services:

- All maltreatment findings were supported by the information gathered and appropriately documented in the investigative record. **96% of all applicable cases.**
- Based on the child/family needs, the immediate service and/or ongoing supervision needs were identified for the child, mother, father, other caregiver and/or caretaker responsible, if other than the mother or father. **94% of all applicable cases.**
- If immediate services or ongoing supervision was needed, referrals for these services were completed for the child, mother, father and
other caregiver or caretaker responsible (if other than the mother or father). 100% of all applicable cases.

- If documentation reflects the need for immediate services and/or ongoing supervision, the investigation record contained evidence the services were engaged. 100% of all applicable cases.

Opportunities for improvement were noted in the following standard relating to Determining Maltreatment Findings, Family Needs, and Services:

- The CPI worked in partnership with the Child Protection Team (CPT) to identify child maltreatment, current and long term concerns and child and family service needs. 78% of all applicable cases.

In one case the CPI was instructed to obtain medical records for a medical consult with CPT. This was not completed and was a mandatory CPT referral.

E. Planning for Safe Investigation Case Closure

The following standards consider whether information gathered during investigations was appropriately shared between and among all parties including supervisors, case managers, substitute caregivers, and service providers, and acted upon as necessary. An overall score of 81% was received for Planning for Safe Investigation Case Closure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEW STANDARD</th>
<th>Achieved (9)</th>
<th>Mostly Achieved (7)</th>
<th>Partially Achieved (5)</th>
<th>Not Achieved (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Communication between the CPI and CM</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Thorough investigation / ensuring child safety</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Appropriate supervisory guidance and direction</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Supervisory follow up</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Notifying CM of case closure and findings.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.1 Plan for case closure was individualized and considered long-term view for child safety</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REVIEW STANDARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Achieved (9)</th>
<th>Mostly Achieved (7)</th>
<th>Partially Achieved (5)</th>
<th>Not Achieved (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. CPI obtained medical information for the child upon removal and shared with the caregiver.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of Excellence were noted in the following standard relating to Planning for Safe Investigation Case Closure:

- The plan for closing the investigation case was thoughtful, individualized and matched to the child and family's present situation, preferences, and long-term view for child safety. **93% of all applicable cases.**

Opportunities for Improvement were noted in the following standard relating to Planning for Safe Investigation Case Closure:

- If there was an active services case when the investigative report was received, timely and appropriate communication and collaboration between the CPI and Case Manager occurred to assure mutual understanding of history and current events. **50% of two applicable cases.**

In one of the cases there was documentation of attempts to contact the case manager but no documentation of actual contact with the case manager to discuss the investigation, services case, or assess for additional service needs.

- The investigation was thorough and appropriate steps were taken to ensure child safety. **84% of all applicable cases.**

There were various reasons seven of the cases did not fully achieve this standard. Some of the case work activities missing included: interviews with victims, some maltreatments not being addressed, observations and interactions were not notated, lack of diligent attempts to see victims, and follow up on a three year old child found home alone.

- Appropriate supervisory guidance and direction were provided and ensured a thorough investigation completed. **84% of all applicable cases.**
There was additional supervisory guidance needed such as instructing the CPI to interview all victims and children, document interactions, and to document observations of the children.

- When the investigation was being closed, the case file documents the CPI or CPI Supervisor ensured the receiving case management agency was notified of the closure, and the completed transfer of responsibilities from the CPI to case management was clearly communicated. **50% of four applicable cases.**

In two cases there was no documentation of the Community Based Care agency being notified the investigation was closing and sole responsibility was turned over to their agency.

- The CPI obtained medical information, including prescribed medicines, and/or other needs of the child as known by the parent, guardian or legal custodian and shared the necessary information with the substitute caregiver. **0% of one applicable case.**

There was one removal case and there was no documentation that the CPI obtained the required medical information to share with the caregiver.

### 3. Requests for Action

A Request for Action (RFA), either “administrative” or “child safety”, is generated when there is an unresolved concern related to child safety, permanency, or well-being. There were no RFAs generated during the fourth quarter file reviews.

### 4. Recommendations

Circuit 1 is encouraged to focus on the areas identified as opportunities for improvement.
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