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1. Analysis of Investigative File Review Data

   A. Summary of Cases Reviewed

      A total of six investigations were reviewed in the first quarter. There were no removal cases reviewed. There was one case which was open to CBC services at the time of the report. Three reports involved Inadequate Supervision maltreatments and two were closed with Not Substantiated findings. The other was closed with No Indicators. One report was closed with Not Substantiated findings for Substance misuse and one was Not Substantiated for Physical Injury. The remaining case was verified for Sexual Abuse. Cases were open anywhere from 28-48 days. One case had only one prior report. Three cases had five or less prior reports. The other two cases had seven and eleven 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 2 received a score of 91% for the 28 standards related to the Investigative Response Domain. There were no removal cases selected from the random sample from the first quarter. Therefore, the standards related to the Emergency Response Domain were not applicable.

      **Circuit 2 received an overall score of 91% 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 94% 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>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Safety assessment process</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Relevant collateral contacts</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</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>100%</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:

- 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. **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.

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>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interviews with children</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</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>17%</td>
<td>83%</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:

- 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 one applicable case.**
- 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. **96% 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 standard 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 investigation. 82% of all applicable cases.

The cases mostly or partially achieving this standard lacked documentation of interactions with caregivers and/or there were multiple children in the home and observations for at least one of the children were missing.

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 88% 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>67%</td>
<td>33%</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>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</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>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</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>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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 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. 93% 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 three applicable cases.

Opportunities for Improvement were noted in the following standard related 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. 78% of three applicable cases.

One case partially achieved the standard. The CSA states the mother engaged in services. It is unclear if this information came from the mother or the service provider, as contact with the service provider is not documented. The other case which mostly achieved the standard made contact with the service provider who had been unable to locate the family because they moved. The CPI gave the provider the new address but no follow up with the provider was documented after providing the new information to locate the family.

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 86% 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>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Thorough investigation / ensuring child safety</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Appropriate supervisory guidance and direction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Supervisory follow up</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. Notifying CM of case closure and findings.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of Excellence 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. **100% of one applicable case.**

- 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 transfer of responsibilities from CPI to case management was clearly communicated. **100% of one applicable case.**

- 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:

- The investigation was thorough and appropriate steps were taken to ensure child safety. **82% of all applicable cases.**

There were various reasons five of the six cases reviewed mostly achieved this standard. One case did not assess for services for the step-father in a domestic violence case. One case did not add a maltreatment to the report which was investigated. Another case did not document interviews which addressed one of the maltreatments, while other maltreatments were addressed. Another case did not document the reason for the discrepancy in findings with those of CPT, as well as needing follow up with the father’s mental health provider. Two of the cases were lacking
some of the criminal history checks or an assessment of criminal history.

- Appropriate supervisory guidance and direction were provided and ensured a thorough investigation was completed. 78% 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 2 is encouraged to focus on improvement to the areas noted as opportunities for improvement.
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