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1. Analysis of Investigative File Review Data

A. Summary of Cases Reviewed

A total of seven investigations were reviewed in the first quarter. One report involved a removal which was later dropped during the investigation when the children were court ordered to return to another state with a relative. There were no cases which were open to CBC services at the time of the report. Four reports involved Inadequate Supervision maltreatments and two were closed with Verified findings. One was closed Not Substantiated and the other with No Indicators. Two reports were closed with Verified findings for Substance misuse. The remaining case was closed with Not Substantiated findings of Family Violence Threatens Child. Cases were open anywhere from 37-53 days. Only one case had no prior reports but did have prior history in another state. The rest of the cases had anywhere from five to 28 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 14 received a score of 89% for the 28 standards related to the Investigative Response Domain. There was one removal case selected from the random sample from the first quarter. Circuit 14 received a score of 91% for the standards related to the Emergency Response Domain.

Circuit 14 received an overall score of 89% for the first quarter.
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 91% 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>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Safety assessment process</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Relevant collateral contacts</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Obtaining pertinent information from collaterals</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. CLS staffing held when warranted and a petition was filed when legally sufficient</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Upon removal, a determination regarding ICWA was made</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</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. **94% 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. **100% of all applicable cases.**

• 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. **100% of two applicable cases.**

• Upon removing the child from his/her home, the CPI made the appropriate inquiries to determine if the child was of American Indian or Native Alaskan descent so that the appropriate tribe could be contacted. **100% of one applicable case.**

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

• Relevant collateral contacts were completed during the course of the investigation. **79% of all applicable cases.**

One case reviewed had no collateral contacts documented. Two other cases not fully achieving the standard documented contact with most of the relevant collaterals but omitted contact with one relevant collateral. One case lacked contact with the mental health provider who was prescribing psychotropic medications to a parent. The other lacked contact with a friend of the victim who could have provided relevant information regarding the allegations.

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 87% 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</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interviews with children</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interviews with parents &amp; caregivers</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Relevant observations and interactions of children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>29%</th>
<th>57%</th>
<th>14%</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Areas of excellence were noted in the following standards 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 was unsuccessful, regular attempts (daily and at varying locations and times of the day) are required until all child victims are seen. 100% of three applicable cases.

- Interviews that addressed all maltreatments were conducted with the mother, father, other caregiver, alleged perpetrator (if other than the mother or father), and other adult household members. 94% of all applicable cases.

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

- 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. 76% of five applicable cases.

  One report had no documentation of an attempt to interview the victims or other children. The victims were two and three years old. There was another child in the home who was four years old. There was no documentation of an assessment of their verbal skills to determine if they were able to be interviewed. The other report partially achieving this standard documented one attempt to interview the victim. The victim shut the door in the CPI’s face. There were no additional attempts to interview the victim at a later date.

- Substantive observations and interactions of the children with family members were completed and documented during the course of the investigation. 81% of all applicable cases.

  All reports reviewed documented physical observations of the children. The cases mostly or partially achieving this standard lacked documentation of interactions with caregivers and/or documentation of developmental or behavioral information.
**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 92% 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>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Maltreatment findings supported by evidence</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. CPI completed an ESI to determine if family preservation services could prevent removal.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Service needs were identified</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</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. **100% of all applicable cases.**
- If at any point during the investigation placement of the child outside of the home was a possibility, the CPI requested an Early Services Intervention (ESI) Staffing to determine if the Community Based Care. **100% of one applicable case.**
- 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 three 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 two applicable cases.
- Prior to removal, the CPI made concerted efforts to provide appropriate services that would allow the child to remain safely in his/her own home. 100% of one applicable case.

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

- 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. 75% of four applicable cases

One case did not achieve this standard. The report involved family violence between the mother and father and also between the father and his mother. The only statement regarding services was found in the Child Safety Assessment, and it indicated no services were needed at this time. The CPI supervisor directed the CPI to refer the family to Refuge House and also offer counseling for the children. There was no documentation this occurred.

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 87% 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>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Thorough investigation / ensuring child safety</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Appropriate supervisory guidance and direction</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Supervisory follow up</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. Notifying CM of case closure and findings.

| 28.1 Plan for case closure was individualized and considered long-term view for child safety | 86% | - | 14% | - |

35. CPI obtained medical information for the child upon removal and shared with the caregiver.

| 35. CPI obtained medical information for the child upon removal and shared with the caregiver. | 100% | - | - | - |

*some scores for Standards do not total 100% due to individual scores being plus or minus ½ %.

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

- Follow through occurred on the supervisory guidance and direction provided, or there was documentation it was no longer necessary. 91% of all applicable cases.
- 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. 94% of all applicable cases.
- 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. 100% of one applicable case.

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

- The investigation was thorough and appropriate steps were taken to ensure child safety. 81% of all applicable cases.

There were various reasons four of the cases mostly achieved this standard. One case needed a safety plan, but one was not developed. One case needed additional collaterals and subsequent efforts to interview a victim after he initially refused. Another case lacked documentation of attempts to interview victims and interactions of the children with caregivers. The final case mostly achieving the standard did not address the mother’s mental health issues with her, which was relevant to the investigation. A collateral with the mother’s mental health provider was also not documented.
One case partially achieved this standard. This case lacked documentation of any collateral contacts as well as documentation of an interview with the father regarding the allegations, and there was no service assessment to address the needs of the family.

- Appropriate supervisory guidance and direction were provided and ensured a thorough investigation was completed. **81% of all applicable cases**.

The cases not fully achieving this standard warranted additional supervisory guidance to address the deficiencies noted above.

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 first quarter file reviews.

4. **Recommendations**

Circuit 14 is encouraged to focus on improvement to the areas noted as opportunities for improvement.
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