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1. Analysis of Investigative File Review Data

   A. Summary of Cases Reviewed

      A total of five investigations were reviewed in the third quarter. There were no removal cases reviewed. Two reports involved Family Violence Threatens Child allegations. Both were closed with No Indicators. One report was closed with No Indicators for Physical Injury and one was closed with No Indicators for Inadequate Supervision. The remaining case was closed as Not Substantiated for Substance Misuse. Cases were open anywhere from 8 to 42 days. Two cases had one prior each. One case had two priors. The remaining two cases had ten and fifteen priors.

   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 2 received a score of 95% for the 28 standards related to the Investigative Response Domain. There was no removal case selected from the random sample for the third quarter. Therefore, the standards related to the Emergency Response Domain were not applicable.

      Circuit 2 received an overall score of 95% for the second 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 97% 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>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Relevant collateral contacts</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</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>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Upon removal, a determination regarding ICWA was made</td>
<td>-</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. **96% of all applicable cases.**
• The safety assessment process was completed with sufficient thoroughness to identify risks and develop a safety plan if needed. 91% of all applicable cases.
• Relevant collateral contacts were completed during the course of the investigation. 100% 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.

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 95% 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>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interviews with children</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interviews with parents &amp; caregivers</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Relevant observations and interactions of children</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of Excellence 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. 100% of all 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. 100% of all applicable cases.
Opportunities for Improvement were noted in the following standards relating to Observing and Interviewing Children, Parents, and others:

- Substantive observations and interactions of the children with family members were completed and documented during the course of the investigations. **82% of all applicable cases.**

Three of the five cases did not have documentation of interactions of the children with the adults in the home. One other case did not have specific documentation of observations which led the CPI to determine the interaction between the children and the adults was positive.

**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>-</td>
<td>-</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>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Service needs were identified</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</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>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</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>-</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.
- 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. 100% of three 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 two applicable cases.

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

- If documentation reflects the need for immediate services and/or ongoing supervision, the investigation record contained evidence the services were engaged. 50% of one applicable case.

In one case there was no documentation with ELC to ensure services were engaged prior to closure of the investigation.

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 96% 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>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. Appropriate supervisory guidance and direction  
   40%  60%  -  -  -

27. Supervisory follow up  
   100%  -  -  -  -

28. Notifying CM of case closure and findings.  
   -  -  -  -  -

28.1 Plan for case closure was individualized and considered long-term view for child safety  
   100%  -  -  -  -

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

Areas of Excellence 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. 96% of all applicable cases.
- Follow through occurred on the supervisory guidance and direction provided, or there was documentation it was no longer necessary. 100% 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. 100% of all applicable cases.

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 2 is encouraged to focus on improvement to the areas noted as opportunities for improvement.
Signed by:

Deliia Bland  
Operations Review Specialist  
4/10/13  

Clay McGinn  
Quality Assurance Manager  
4/10/13  

Kathie Penning  
Family and Community Services Program Manager  
4/12/13
## PRACTICE TRENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conducted Thorough Assessment</th>
<th>% Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was a thorough assessment completed throughout the investigative process to include the development of a realistic safety plan when needed?</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed and Interviewed Children, Parents, Others</th>
<th>% Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were informative interviews with children and other participants conducted and substantive observations made of behaviors and interactions between the child victim(s) and family members?</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determined Maltreatment Findings, Family Needs and Services</th>
<th>% Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were appropriate maltreatment findings reached and needed services provided to the alleged child victim(s) and family to promote positive outcomes and improve child-well-being?</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned for Safe Investigation Case Closure</th>
<th>% Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was information gathered during the investigation appropriately shared between and among all parties including the supervisor, case manager, substitute caregivers, etc., and acted upon as necessary?</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CPI visited the child in shelter.

The CPI obtained medical information.

A physical inspection of the home was performed.

When the CPI placed the child with relative caregivers, the CPI...

Once the decision was made to remove the child...

Prior to the removal, the CPI made...

The plan for closing the investigation was:

Follow through occurred on the home visit.

On-going supervisory guidance is:

Mother

Child (Not restricted to the focus child)

If immediate services or ongoing supervisory guidance was not added by the teams...

An interview was conducted with...

Interviews that addressed all maltreatment findings were:

Diligent attempts to see the child were made.

Required background checks were:

Appropriate supervisory guidance included:

Initial supervisory guidance was:

On-going supervisory guidance was:

Follow through occurred on the home visit:

The CPI followed through on the home visit:

The CPI supervisor ensured the child's safety:

The CPI supervisor ensured the child's safety:

The CPI Supervisor ensured follow up:

When the investigation was begun:

The plan for closing the investigation was:

Prior to the removal, the CPI made...

Upon removing the child from home:

When the decision was made to...

When the CPI placed the child with...

The CPI placed the child in...

A physical inspection of the home:

An evaluation of the property: