DATE: December 14, 2010

TO: John Cooper, Circuit 9 Administrator
    Dawn Murray, Circuit 9 Operations Manager

FROM: Traci Klinkbeil, Central Region Quality Assurance Manager
      Teresa Vella, Quality Assurance Specialist


The semi-annual Quality Assurance (QA) review for Circuit 9 Child Protective Investigations was conducted September 20, 2010 through September 24, 2010. Preliminary review findings were presented at the Exit Conference on October 11, 2010. This review represents the first comprehensive CPI semi-annual QA review of Circuit 9 in Fiscal Year 2010-2011.

The QA review sample included investigative reports closed between June 1, 2010 and July 31, 2010. Application of a 90% confidence level and 10% confidence interval reflected sixty-six (66) investigations. This review included half of the 90/10 sample which resulted in the review of thirty-three (33) reports, including four (4) reports that involved an emergency removal.

The Circuit 9 overall performance achieved for this review is 86%. Circuit 9 achieved the following overall percentage for Fiscal Year 2009-2010 reviews:
First half of FY 2009-2010  89%
Second half of FY 2009-2010  90%

Circuit: 9  Date of Review: September 20 through September 24, 2010

Sample Period: Investigations closed between June 1, 2010 and July 31, 2010

Methodology

For this semi-annual comprehensive QA review, the following standardized statewide parameters effective July 2010 determined the sample size methodology. A sampling methodology based on the 90% confidence level and 10% confidence interval formula provides the Circuit with a 90% confidence level that the findings represent the total population. The sample selection uses the Florida Safe Families Network (FSFN) “Child Investigation and Special Condition Status Report District-Daily”. The sample excludes “Special Conditions”, Institutional Investigations and investigations closed as “No Jurisdiction” or “Duplicate”. The semi-annual review used one-half of the 90/10 random samples.

Utilizing the above stated methodology, the population size consisted of 2521 Circuit 9 reports closed between June 1, 2010 and July 31, 2010 (60 day review period). Applying a 90% confidence level and a 10% confidence interval resulted in a sample size of 66. Of the initial sample of 66 reports, random selection was made on the random number table to arrive at the final sample of 33 reports. Four of the 33 investigations reviewed involved an emergency removal. Seven over-sample cases were selected to be used if needed. The review process included detailed reviews of the investigative case files and surveys completed by key community stakeholders.

Circuit 9 consists of 23 units providing Child Protective Investigations. The 23 units are divided amongst three Program Administrators (PA). PA Lawrence currently has 6 units, PA King currently has 6 units, PA Hammett currently has 6 units and PA Shea currently has 5 units. The random distribution of the final sample of 33 reports per county was as follows: Osceola County 10 cases 31%, Robinson 7 cases 21%, Pine Hills 8 cases 24% and Saratoga 8 cases 24%. (Chart 1 Below)
The QA unit reviewed investigations using the Quality of Practice Standards for Child Protective Investigations (revised July 2010) to focus on qualitative standards. Although qualitatively driven, some important compliance standards are included. An example would be measuring if statutory requirements were met in referring the child to the Child Protection Team (CPT) when required. The main qualitative standard (#24) requires the reviewer to determine if the investigation was thorough.

The review tool was revised in July 2010. The revision includes the elimination of two review questions from the previous tool Investigative Response portion. These questions are 1.17: The correct Incident Date was entered in the investigation report with verified findings, and Question 1.28: “Results Determination”. Question # 28 was replaced with “Investigation Closure Notification”: When the investigation was being closed, the case file reflects the CPI or CPI supervisor ensured the receiving case management agency was notified of the closure, and the completed transfer of responsibilities from CPI to case management was clearly communicated. Additional sub-elements have been added to question 7, “Safety Assessment/Safety Plan”. These are 7.2: an updated safety assessment was completed; 7.3: the safety plan, when needed, must be sufficient and identify the immediate and long term actions; and 7.4: the safety plan was documented in FSFN.
The Emergency Removal section has an added sub-element in the Background Checks and Home Inspections question. The additional sub-element is 32.4: the completed home study was documented in FSFN.

The standards and interpretive guidelines provided in the Quality of Practice Standards for Child Protective Investigators, dated July 2010, are located on the Center for Advancement of Child Welfare Practice website under the "Quality Counts" icon.

http://centerforchildwelfare.fmhi.usf.edu/Pages/Default.aspx

A standardized answer key provides guidelines for assessing the degree of compliance with each review element. The Quality of Practice Standards for Protective Investigators specifically directs each reviewer to refer back to the scoring rubric when determining partial compliance. Each standard is evaluated utilizing the following rating scale:

- **9 Requirement Achieved**
  The specific requirements of the review element were met. A score of “9” documents the standard was met and no improvements were needed.

- **7 Requirement Mostly Achieved**
  The specific requirements of the review element were met with some deficiencies or omissions. The reviewer must determine whether the deficiencies or omissions may have negatively impacted the CPI’s assessment of risk and child safety and the disposition of the investigation.

- **5 Requirement Partially Achieved**
  The specific requirements of the review element were met with some significant discrepancies or omissions. The reviewer must use reasonable and professional judgment to determine whether the deficiencies or omissions significantly impacted the assessment of risk and child safety and the disposition of the investigation.

- **0 Requirement Not Achieved**
  The specific requirements of the review element were not met.
### List of Standards and Roll-up data for Circuit 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Question 9 Achieved</th>
<th>Question 7 Achieved</th>
<th>Question 5 Achieved</th>
<th>Question 0 Achieved</th>
<th>Overall % Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Required background checks were completed timely and the information was appropriately used to assess risk to each child.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Background checks were completed on all household members and report subjects age 12 and older.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Prior Reports to the Florida Abuse Hotline</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) for household members ages 12-26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Local Law Enforcement</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4 Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5 Department of Corrections</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.6 Child Welfare Out of State (if the record reflects the family resided in another state)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.7 Prior Case Management Records</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.8 911 Calls or Calls for Service</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.9 Other (may include sexual predator listings, military disciplinary and family advocacy records, or National Crime Information Center (NCIC), when a household member has resided out of state)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Background checks were completed within the established timeframes on all household members and report subjects age 12 and older.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Information obtained from the background checks was used to assess safety, risk, and service needs for each child.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Diligent attempts were made at least daily when a 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 attempts (daily and at varying locations and times of the day) are required until all child victims are seen.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 All other children named in the report and/or residing in the home were seen timely.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 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.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Interviews with child victim(s).

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Interviews with other child(ren).

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Interviews that addressed all maltreatments were conducted with the mother, father, other caregiver and alleged caretaker responsible (alleged perpetrator, if other than the mother or father), and other adult household members.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 Interview with mother

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Interview with father

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Interview with alleged caretaker responsible (if not the mother or father)

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Interviews with other adult household members

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Observations and interactions of the children with family members were completed and documented during the course of the investigation.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Central Region Family Safety Program Office Quality Assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Central Region</th>
<th>Family Safety Program Office</th>
<th>Quality Assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 The safety assessment process was completed with sufficient thoroughness to identify risks and develop a safety plan if needed.</td>
<td>10 30% 20 61% 3 9% 0 0%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>10 30% 20 61% 3 9% 0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 The initial safety assessment was completed with sufficient thoroughness to identify risks.</td>
<td>21 64% 10 30% 1 3% 1 3%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>21 64% 10 30% 1 3% 1 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 The updated safety assessment(s) was completed with sufficient thoroughness to identify risks and accurately reflected information obtained during the course of the investigation.</td>
<td>22 67% 10 30% 1 3% 0 0%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>22 67% 10 30% 1 3% 0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 The safety plan, when needed, must be sufficient and identify the immediate and long term actions required to keep the child safe from harm.</td>
<td>3 13% 12 50% 5 21% 4 17%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3 13% 12 50% 5 21% 4 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 The safety plan was documented in FSFN.</td>
<td>10 45% 0 0% 0 0% 12 55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10 45% 0 0% 0 0% 12 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 The CPI Supervisor identified appropriate indicators requiring the completion of a second party review and a quality review was completed.</td>
<td>15 79% 4 21% 0 0% 0 0%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>15 79% 4 21% 0 0% 0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Relevant collateral contacts were completed during the course of the investigation.</td>
<td>17 52% 9 27% 7 21% 0 0%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>17 52% 9 27% 7 21% 0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Pertinent information was obtained from the collateral contacts and was considered when assessing the overall safety of the child and/or the need for services.</td>
<td>29 88% 4 12% 0 0% 0 0%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>29 88% 4 12% 0 0% 0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Consideration of other professionals' assessment findings and recommendations in the determination of child safety and ongoing protective interventions was documented in the case file.</td>
<td>2 100% 0 0% 0 0% 0 0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2 100% 0 0% 0 0% 0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Region Family Safety Program Office Quality Assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 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.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1 A Children’s Legal Services staffing was held when warranted.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2 A dependency petition was filed or a valid reason for not pursuing a dependency action was documented, when the CLS staffing documented legal sufficiency.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 The alleged child victim(s) was referred to the Child Protection Team (CPT) and the referral was made timely when required.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1 A referral was made to the Child Protection Team (CPT) when required.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2 The referral was timely.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 The date, time, and specific information discussed with the Child Protection Team (CPT) at the time of initial referral were documented in the investigation file.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 CPT assessment findings and recommendations related to child safety were followed or the rationale for not following the assessment and recommendations was documented.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 When the report met mandatory Child Protection Team referral criteria and a face-to-face medical evaluation was not done, the case file documented the supervisor approved the exception decision.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 BLANK - Standard Deleted in 2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>All maltreatment findings were supported by the information gathered and appropriately documented in the investigative record.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>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 (CBC) should provide family preservation services that would allow the child to remain safely in the home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1 Child (Not restricted to focus child or child identified as the victim in the abuse hotline report)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2 Mother</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.3 Father</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.4 Other Caregiver or Caretaker Responsible (if other than the mother or father and has access or ongoing contact with the child)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>If immediate services or ongoing supervision was needed, referrals for these services were documented for the child, mother, father and other caregiver or caretaker responsible (if other than the mother or father).</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.1 Child (Not restricted to the focus child or child identified as the victim in the abuse hotline report).</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.2 Mother</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.3 Father</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.4 Other Caregiver or Caretaker Responsible (if someone other than the mother or father and has access or ongoing contact with the child)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 If documentation reflects the need for immediate services and/or ongoing supervision, the investigation record contained evidence the services were engaged.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 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.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 The investigation was thorough and appropriate steps were taken to ensure child safety.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 The case file documents the CPI’s discussion with the parents or legal custodian to determine if they are of American Indian or Native Alaskan descent.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Appropriate supervisory guidance and direction were provided and ensured a thorough investigation was completed.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.1 Initial supervisory guidance</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.2 On-going supervisory guidance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Follow through occurred on the supervisory guidance and direction provided, or there was documentation it was no longer necessary.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.1 The CPI followed through on the supervisory guidance and direction.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Region</td>
<td>Family Safety Program Office</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.2 The CPI supervisor ensured CPI followed through on supervisory guidance and direction provided or the reason(s) the guidance and direction provided was no longer necessary was documented.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.3 The CPI supervisor ensured the CPI followed through on the 2nd party reviewer guidance and direction, or documented justification actions were no longer necessary.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 When the investigation was being closed, the case file reflects 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.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Prior to the removal, the CPI made concerted efforts to provide appropriate services that would allow the child to remain safely in his/her own home.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 The investigation file documented compliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) through timely initiation of the search process, completing the required ICWA eligibility form, and by notifying the court when required.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.1 The investigation file contained a completed ICWA Eligibility form.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.2 The ICWA checklist was completed if the child was reported to be a member of a tribe or was eligible to be a member of a tribe.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.3 If American Indian or Native Alaskan descent was claimed, the search process was initiated timely by contacting the designated tribe or Bureau of Indian Affairs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.4 The court was informed when a child was determined to be a member of a tribe or eligible to be a member.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Once the decision was made to remove the child, placement priority was given to responsible relatives/non-relatives rather than licensed care.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 When the CPI placed the child with relatives or non-relatives, the case file contained evidence of required background checks and a physical inspection of the home prior to the child's placement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1 The required background checks were completed during the home study process prior to the child's placement.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.1 Prior abuse reports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.2 Department of Juvenile Justice (ages 12-26)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.3 Local Law Enforcement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.4 Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.5 NCIC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.6 Department of Corrections</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.7 Child Welfare Out of State (if the record reflects the family resided in another state)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.8 Prior case management records</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.9 Other (for example, military records or 911 service calls, as needed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.2 A physical inspection of the home was completed during the home study process prior to the child's placement.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32.3</strong> An evaluation of the prospective caregiver's capacity to protect was completed during the home study process prior to the child's placement.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32.4</strong> The completed home study was documented in FSFN.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33</strong> If removal involved a sibling group, the siblings were placed together with a relative or non-relative caregiver (not in licensed care) when it was in their best interest.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34</strong> If the child was removed and placed in a licensed home or with a relative or non-relative caregiver, a Child Health Check-Up was completed within 72 hours of removal.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34.1</strong> The Child Health Check-Up was completed within 72 hours of the child's removal and a copy is in the case file.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34.2</strong> If the Child Health Check-Up was not completed within 72 hours of the child's removal, the Child Health Check-Up was completed at some point thereafter and a copy was in the case file.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35</strong> The Emergency Intake Form was completed and accurately identified the current medical information, including prescribed medicines, and/or needs of the child as known by the parent, guardian or legal custodian.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36 If the removed child was prescribed psychotropic medications prior to case responsibility being transferred to the case management agency, the CPI obtained written authorization from the parents to continue administration where appropriate and properly initiated the process to obtain written express and informed consent by the parents, or where necessary, a court order.

37 The CPI visited the child in shelter care on a weekly basis until the case was transferred to and accepted by the CBC provider who subsequently agreed to conduct the required visits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Excellence</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local law enforcement checks were completed on initial investigations on all household members and report subjects age 12 and older.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information obtained from the background checks was used to assess child safety, risk and service needs for each child.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview was conducted and addressed all maltreatments with alleged child victim and other children named in the report/or residing in the home.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An interview was conducted and addressed all maltreatments with the father, mother and caretaker responsible.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The updated safety assessment(s) was completed with sufficient thoroughness to identify risks and accurately reflected information obtained during the course of the investigation.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CPI Supervisor identified appropriate indicators requiring the completion of a second party review and a quality review was completed.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pertinent information was obtained from the collateral contacts.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT referrals were made when required and were made timely.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltreatment findings were supported.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the child/family needs, the immediate service and/or ongoing supervision needs were identified for the child, mother, and father.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals for these services were documented for the mother and father.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pertinent information was obtained from the collateral contacts.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLS staffing was held when warranted and dependency petition was filed or a valid reason for not pursuing dependency action was documented, when CLS staffing documented legal sufficiency.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Investigative File Review Data
- The case file appropriately documented discussion with the parents or legal custodian as to whether or not they were American Indian/Native Alaskan descent.
- Initial supervisory guidance is appropriate.
- Placement priority was given to relatives/non-relatives.
- If removal involved sibling group, siblings were placed together with a relative or non-relative.
- A physical inspection of the home and protective capacity of the caregiver was documented.

**Opportunities for Improvement:**

- Required background checks were completed timely on all household members and report subjects age 12 and older (prior abuse reports, FDLE, Department of Corrections, child welfare out-of-state checks, prior case management records and 911 calls or calls for service)
- Diligent attempts were made at least daily when a child victim was not seen immediately or within 24 hours of report receipt from the Florida Abuse Hotline. Specific and relevant observations and interactions of the family members were documented.
- The safety plan, when needed, must be sufficient and identify the immediate and long-term actions needed to keep the child from harm.
- The safety plan was documented in FSFN.
- The date, time, and specific information discussed with the CPT at the time of initial referral were documented in the investigation file. Based on the child/family needs, the immediate service and/or ongoing supervision needs were identified for the other caregiver or caretaker responsible.
- Referrals for these services were documented for the child and other caregiver or caretaker responsible.
- The investigative record contained evidence the services were engaged.
- 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.
- Ongoing Supervisory guidance was provided.
- Investigation was thorough and appropriate steps were taken to ensure child safety.
- When the investigation was being closed, the case file reflects the CPI or Supervisor ensured the receiving case Management agency was notified of the closure, and the transfer of responsibilities from CPI to Case Management was clearly documented.
- The CPI supervisor ensured CPI followed through on supervisory guidance.
- Prior to the removal, the CPI made concerted efforts to provide appropriate services that would allow the child to remain safely in his/her own home.
- The investigation file contained a completed ICWA Eligibility form.
- When placed with relatives or non-relatives, required background checks were completed for prior abuse reports, local law enforcement, NCIC, child welfare out-of-state, and prior case management records.
An evaluation of the prospective caregiver's capacity to protect was completed during the home study process prior to the child's placement.

The completed home study was documented in FSFN.

Child health check-up was completed within 72 hours of removal. [also noted as an opportunity March 2010 Review]

The Emergency Intake Form was accurately completed with identified medical information and needs of the child. [also noted as an opportunity March 2010 Review]

If the removed child was prescribed psychotropic medications prior to case responsibility being transferred to the case management agency, the CPI obtained written authorization from the parents to continue administration. (applicable to only one case in the review sample)

The CPI visited the child in shelter care on a weekly basis until the case was transferred to and accepted by CBC who subsequently agrees to conduct the required visits. [also noted as an opportunity March 2010 Review]

**Additional Review Elements**

Central Region QA has incorporated the following additional review elements during its Circuit level semi-annual CPI reviews. These additional review elements are summarized below in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TANF eligibility correctly completed for the investigation.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the investigator documented taking pictures of the home, children, etc. the pictures were in the case file.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was no “gap” in time (30 days or more) during the investigation of investigative tasks completed by the investigator.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the investigator immediately orally notify the state attorney or local law enforcement of the report if any of the following situations occurred? There was a threat to the child’s immediate safety or well-being, the family was likely to flee, the child died due to abuse, abandonment, neglect, the child was a victim of aggravated child abuse, or the child was a victim of sexual battery or sexual abuse. Did the investigator transmit a fully written report to the state attorney and local law enforcement within three working days</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the investigator provide notification to the family regarding their Rights &amp; Responsibilities / HIPPA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Injunction Process: If the report involved a situation which required restricting the access of a parent or caregiver.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FSFN was updated after initial assessment and re-submitted for supervisory review and second party review under the following circumstances: 1. After initial contact with the child or any other subject of the report, when the initial contact occurs after the initial submission of the Child Safety Assessment. 2. At any stage of the investigation when a determination is being made whether or not to remove the child from the home; 3. As often as necessary to ensure the child’s safety; 4. As new information is received which may have an impact on child safety; 5. When the circumstances change within the child’s environment at times other than required under this section; 6. Prior to the development of a recommendation to the court for disposition in cases being considered for judicial action; and 7. Prior to closure of the investigation in FSFN.

The second party reviewer was appropriately credentialed to complete the second party review for both initial and updated child safety assessments.

For circuit 9 reviews only: If the case was staffed for ESI for services (aka Initial Case Conference), the CPI invited the parents to attend the ICC.

- TANF eligibility was improperly documented in 16 of the reports reviewed. CPIs are required to checkmark participants based on eligibility and inclusion criteria, which is not being correctly identified.
- Six of the 33 reports documented that the investigator took pictures. In 2 of the 6 reports pictures could not be located in file by the reviewer.
- In 7 of the reports reviewed, a significant time gap in investigative activity of 30 days or more was indicated.
- One of the 33 reports reviewed was ascertained to be an appropriate situation for a Ch 39 injunction.

**Requests for Action**

There were three Safety Requests for Action (RFA) generated during the review due to child safety concerns.

The first RFA involved a seven year old child with epilepsy and a physical deformity. The child was reported to be on medication, had difficulty speaking and could not run. The child was picked up from school on a regular basis by the mother though this ceased due to the mother getting a new job. The child then began walking home from school alone with no supervision. There was concern for the child’s safety based upon the seizure disorder and physical difficulties. It was reported by the mother that the child walked home and met an uncle in a park at his apartment complex and if the uncle was not there the individuals in the apartment office were allegedly watching the child. The collaterals in the case included an aunt, teacher and principal. There was no documented contact with the uncle or the complex staff with regard to their role in supervising the child. The level of disability was not established through contact with the child’s medical providers to ascertain the child’s level of functioning or to verify the medication for the seizure disorder. A safety plan was
not developed with the mother or caregivers caring for the child regarding the supervision arrangements made.

The RFA recommended the following:

- Contact additional relevant collaterals to include the apartment complex staff, the uncle, school and medical providers of the child. Determine what the child’s current arrangements are for getting home from school. Develop a safety plan, as needed.

A response to the RFA was received stating that the areas of concern had been addressed and that appropriate action had been sought in order to facilitate child safety. All areas of the request for action were completed.

The second RFA involved four children aged 7 months, 3, 5 and 9 years old. The initial report indicated the mother was inadequately supervising the children; had mental health concerns and made bad decisions with regard to the children; she was not stable and did not want the children. At commencement of the investigation the children were residing with their aunt who reported she would be unable to care for the children without assistance. Food and supplies were provided to the aunt for the interim period. An 02 additional report was received, which alleged the mother had no food for the children and the conditions of the home were deplorable. The documentation indicated the CPI saw two of the children who were sleeping and were pointed out by the mother. The mother was not interviewed at this point and this was the first time that the mother was seen face to face by the CPI. There was no documentation the home was observed or that the other children were seen. The youngest child in the case was not seen throughout the investigation and her safety was not assessed. The child was allegedly residing with the godmother who was contacted by phone.

The RFA recommended the following:

- Contact Orange County schools to ascertain if the oldest two children are attending school and what is being used as their home address. Contact the school staff as collateral. Contact ACCESS to see if the mother has updated her home address in their records. Re-contact the godmother of the child who was not seen. See the child and assess her safety, including background checks on the godmother. Inquire of the godmother why she has the child? How long has she had the child? What does she know of the mother’s situation, care of her children? Does she know the current location of the children? Contact the apartment manager where the mother had been living to inquire about any concerns regarding the condition of the apartment or supervision concerns. If the mother can be located, interview her regarding all of the concerns alleged, assess the mother’s ability to appropriately supervise and care for her children and inquire as to why she is receiving SSI. Are there mental health concerns, treatment and medications?

A response to the RFA was received stating that the areas of concern had been addressed and that appropriate action had been sought in order to facilitate child safety. All areas of the request for action were completed.
The third RFA involved a 13 year old child allegedly physically abused by his mother and subsequently recanted the allegation. Inadequate supervision was also alleged with regard to the 3 year old sibling. In a prior investigation non-judicial protective supervision was initiated due to excessive corporal punishment and the mother was reported to be non compliant in that case. The child was seen at CPT and found to be indeterminate for physical abuse. The child has a DJJ history and was on probation at the time the report was received. Prior to closure of the investigation the child changed living arrangements, as the mother voluntarily placed the child with a non relative caregiver who was alleged to be the child’s step-father. It was alleged step-father had a criminal history, though there were no records located in the file. Safety was not assessed with regard to the child’s new home environment. The home was not observed and background checks were not completed on all household members.

The RFA recommended the following:
- Background checks to be completed on all parties residing in the step-father’s home. Observe the condition of the step-father’s home. Determine if services are needed in the home. What is the plan with regard to the child’s DJJ status? Confirm daycare is in place for the 3 year old child in the mother’s care.

A response to the RFA was received stating that the areas of concern had been addressed and that appropriate action had been sought in order to facilitate child safety. All areas of the request for action were completed.

**Stakeholder Surveys**

The review instrument for stakeholder interviews is comprised of three sections. The first two sections have 19 response elements and the third section is for additional information, comments or concerns. Respondents are asked to rate Circuit 9 Child Protective Investigations in each of the areas using a five point scale, including “Strongly Agree”, “Agree”, “Neutral”, “Disagree” and “Strongly Disagree”.

For the current Circuit 9 CPI review, five community stakeholders were interviewed. These stakeholders included a representative from the CPT, a Circuit Judge, a Community Based Care service provider, Children’s Legal Services and Local Law Enforcement agency. Using the five-point rating scale, overall stakeholders responded very positively. Neutral responses are no longer included in the survey. (Table 2 below)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART I - General Information</th>
<th>% of Disagree / Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>% of Agree/ Somewhat Agree</th>
<th># of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CPI staff are accessible to my organization (i.e. easy to locate, return telephone calls, timely, etc.)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CPI staff meets as often as necessary with me or members of my organization, e.g. participate in staffing or community workgroups/meetings.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CPI staff listens and considers my ideas and information.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Circuit administration and/or Operation Program Administrator resolve issues or disagreements between our respective organizations in a timely and satisfactory manner.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Circuit administration and/or Operation Program Administrator have an effective partnership with my organization at the administrative/management level.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CPI staff has an effective partnership with my organization at the direct services level.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CPI staff does a good job identifying children at risk and provide emergency services or removal and placement when warranted.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Overall the CPI program has a good working relationship with my organization.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART II - Children’s Legal Services</th>
<th>% of Disagree / Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>% of Agree/ Somewhat Agree</th>
<th># of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CPIs dress and act professionally in court.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CPIs are well prepared for legal staffings and provide me with the information needed to make sound legal decisions.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CPIs are knowledgeable about their Cases and are effective witnesses in court.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Court documents prepared by CPIs are well-written and provide the necessary information</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication and collaboration is evident between the CPIs and CBC staff on mutually assigned court Cases.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CPI’s follow through with CLS recommendations in a timely manner and provide feedback to CLS.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part III - CBC Agencies and Other Service Providers</th>
<th>% of Disagree / Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>% of Agree/ Somewhat Agree</th>
<th># of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The CPI’s Referral information provided by the CPI’s gives us the needed information to understand the case situation and provide our services.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The CPI’s referrals to our program are timely (based on the families situations and the types of services needed).provided by are timely.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The CPI’s follow-up with us to determine whether our services were initiated with the children/families referred.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. CPIs involve us in decision-making on mutually assigned cases when appropriate.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Disagree</th>
<th>% of Agree</th>
<th># of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. CPIs involve us in decision-making on mutually assigned cases when appropriate.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. CPIs have a good working knowledge of the services we provide to children and families and make appropriate referrals.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Disagree</th>
<th>% of Agree</th>
<th># of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. CPIs have a good working knowledge of the services we provide to children and families and make appropriate referrals.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. CPIs keep us informed about our mutual cases and notify us before they close or transfer their cases.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Disagree</th>
<th>% of Agree</th>
<th># of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. CPIs keep us informed about our mutual cases and notify us before they close or transfer their cases.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part IV - Child Protection Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Disagree / Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>% of Agree / Somewhat Agree</th>
<th># of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The CPIs referral to the Child Protection Team was made timely when required.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CPIs provided case specific information to our program that included the current situation and the history of the family.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CPT assessment findings and recommendations related to child safety were followed through on by CPIs.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part V – Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Disagree / Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>% of Agree / Somewhat Agree</th>
<th># of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, I am satisfied with our CPI program.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are there additional or new community resources you think are needed to better serve children and families?</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are you aware of any innovative approaches or programs in your circuit you would like to highlight?</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there additional information you’d like to share?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Interviews</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are some comments from the stakeholders:

- Communication is very important and has to be maintained in order for our agencies to work together successfully.
- On the whole the working relationships have improved greatly.
- The Administration is very receptive to all concerns and responds immediately.

**Correction Plan Analysis**

A correction plan was received for the prior C9 review in February 2010 in which critical areas were addressed with required time frames and responsible parties to ensure that the action plan was completed. (Attachment 1 summary of plan) The action plan from the prior review includes areas that are active and ongoing. A current action plan is pending receipt with C9 in order to address areas of improvement from the current review. There are areas that were found in the current review that were addressed in the prior action plan, such as the Emergency Intake Form was accurately completed with identified medical information and needs of the child. As reported above there are key areas of improvement that are a duplication of the prior review and are presenting as trends.
Summary and Recommendations

Circuit 9 should focus their improvement strategies on the following recommendations that present opportunities for qualitative improvement across the Circuit. Administrative and operations staff, in conjunction with the Family Safety Program Office staff, will develop action plans, develop and conduct in-service training and provide supervisory oversight to address the following elements:

- Service centers should continue to improve the documentation of specific and relevant observations of children found in S.S. 39.301(10) (b), F.S.; & 65C-29.003(3) (c) Florida Administrative Code. In order for the CPI to determine whether there is any indication that a child in the family or household was abused, abandoned or neglected, the CPI must observe the child’s interaction with his/her family especially an alleged perpetrator or caregiver responsible, as well as all other children in the household. The documentation of specific and relevant observations of the children during the investigation includes, but is not limited to, physical appearance, developmental progress, behavioral indicators and interaction with others in the household. The CPI is required to describe the physical and emotional state of children and relevant parent/child interactions. Observations documented in the file should give the reader a sense of each child’s present state of overall well-being. Phrases such as “free of marks and bruises” or “child appeared happy, healthy and bonded,” are not sufficient when assessing qualitative interactions and observations. More individualized and substantive statements are needed to fully assess child safety. This recommendation was also outlined in the prior Semi-Annual Quality Assurance Review Report in March 2010 as an area in need of improvement.

- The circuit should also continue to improve the completion of required background checks for the investigative response and emergency removal, especially focusing on the completion of background checks for all household members, who were added to the investigation after receipt or updated demographics were obtained. Supporting documentation of the background checks should be located in the file such as Local Law Enforcement Checks and Calls for Service. S.39.301(9) (b) 3, F.S & 65C-29.003 (j), & 65C-29.009, F.A. This recommendation was also outlined in the prior Semi-Annual Quality Assurance Review Report in March 2010 as an area in need of improvement.

- When service referrals have been made during the course of the investigation, the Child Protective Investigator must follow-up with the service provider to ensure that the referred individual(s) have engaged in the service. The case file must document the contact with the service provider and outcome of the service referral. It is recommended that if the individual(s) referred are not engaged in the service, the investigator must determine if there are alternative interventions available to alleviate the identified risk. The investigator must also assess the immediate and long term safety concerns to the children without the referred service intervention prior to case
closure. 39.301(9) (a); & 39.301(15) (a), F.S. This recommendation was previously provided in the last Semi-Annual Quality Assurance Review Report in March 2010.

- The Emergency Intake forms must be completed on each child taken into custody in accordance with Florida Administrative Code 65C-29.003(5) (a) 1 d. The CPI must ensure that a copy is maintained in the investigative case file, as well as being provided to the Case Management Organization at the time of the staffing. The Emergency Intake form can be located on DCF Forms (DCF Intranet), Form CF-FSP 5314. This recommendation was previously provided in the last Semi-Annual Quality Assurance Review Report in March 2010.

- Circuit 10 administration identify the barriers to obtaining timely Child Health Check Ups at the time of removal and implement an action plan for ensuring the completion of the Child Health Check Up as required by Florida Administrative Codes 65C-29.008 (1), 65C-30.001(17), and 65C30.002 (1) (g) 1 and 4. This recommendation was also made as a result of the March 2010 review and this continues to be an area in need of improvement.
## Attachment 1 – Circuit 9 Corrective Action Plan from February 2010

### Goal 1: The Child Protective Investigators will conduct a timely and quality investigative response in accordance with Chapter 39.

#### Strategy A: Required Background checks will be completed timely and the information will be used to assess risk to each child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Office and Lead Person Responsible</th>
<th>Evidence of Completion</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All Child Protective Investigator Supervisors and Child Protective Investigators will be trained on the requirements for background checks i.e. pulling the background checks timely.</td>
<td>Peer Counselors/ Nicole Musgray</td>
<td>QA results and periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>3/31/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Child Protective Investigator Supervisors will ensure that background checks are in the file at the time that the 72 hour review is conducted. If they are not in the file, the Supervisor will return the file to the CPI.</td>
<td>Child Protective Investigator Supervisors</td>
<td>QA results and periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>3/31/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strategy B: Background checks will be completed on all household members and report subjects age 12 and older. *(Prior Case Management Records)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Office and Lead Person Responsible</th>
<th>Evidence of Completion</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All Child Protective Investigator Supervisors and Child Protective Investigators will be trained on pulling, reviewing and documenting that prior records have been reviewed.</td>
<td>Operations Management Consultants</td>
<td>QA results and periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>3/31/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The CPIS will ensure that cases are linked properly in FSFN.</td>
<td>Child Protective Investigator Supervisors</td>
<td>QA results and periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The CPIS will utilize ticklers as a reminder to ensure that all documentation is in the file.</td>
<td>Child Protective Investigator Supervisors</td>
<td>QA results and periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strategy C: All “other” children named in the report and/or residing in the home will be seen timely. *(Seeing Children Timely)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Office and Lead Person Responsible</th>
<th>Evidence of Completion</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The CPIS and CPI's are currently working on this action step. The CPIS pull the morning report every day. The PA’s will review the report daily and will establish a tracking procedure for their service center. The CPIS are ensuring that the CPI’s are conducting their investigation in a manner where all children in the home will be treated as Child Victims.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Office and Lead Person Responsible</th>
<th>Evidence of Completion</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All Child Protective Investigator Supervisors and Child Protective Investigators will be trained on what a quality observation entails.</td>
<td>Program Administrator</td>
<td>QA results and Periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Child Protective Investigator Supervisors and Child Protective Investigators will be trained on writing skills- how to write a quality CSA and using the right verbiage.</td>
<td>Program Administrator</td>
<td>QA results and Periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy D: Specific and relevant observations and interactions of the children with family members will be completed and documented during the course of the investigation. *(Observations and Interactions of the Children)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Office and Lead Person Responsible</th>
<th>Evidence of Completion</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All Child Protective Investigator Supervisors and Child Protective Investigators will be trained on what a quality observation entails.</td>
<td>Program Administrator</td>
<td>QA results and Periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>4/30/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Child Protective Investigator Supervisors and Child Protective Investigators will be trained on writing skills- how to write a quality CSA and using the right verbiage.</td>
<td>Program Administrator</td>
<td>QA results and Periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy E: The investigator and supervisor will identify appropriate factors requiring the completion of 2\textsuperscript{nd} party review and such review will be completed within 72 hours. *(Factors for Second Party Review)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Office and Lead Person Responsible</th>
<th>Evidence of Completion</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All Child Protective Investigator Supervisors will be proactive and begin their reviews on the 1\textsuperscript{st} day instead of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} day.</td>
<td>Program Administrators</td>
<td>QA results and Periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The CPIS will ensure that the CPI’s have updated all unknowns before the review is completed.</td>
<td>Child Protective Investigator Supervisors</td>
<td>QA results and Periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy F: The date, time and specific information discussed with the Child Protection Team at the time of the initial referral will be documented in the investigation file.
Child Protective Investigators will be trained on the importance of ensuring that CPT information is documented in the Chronological notes as well as the notification screen is completed. CPI’s will be trained on the importance of ensuring that time of the referral is documented as well as whom they spoke with at CPT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy G: Based on the child/family needs, the immediate service and/or ongoing service needs are appropriately identified for the child, mother, father, other caregiver and/or caretaker responsible, if other than the mother or father. (Identification of Service Needs for the Father)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Steps</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CPIS need to ensure that the father’s needs are identified and the referrals are made for him prior to completing the Supervisory Review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy H: If immediate services or ongoing supervision was needed, referrals for these services will be documented for the child, mother, father and other caregiver or caretaker responsible if other than the mother or father. <em>(Referral for Services for Fathers)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Steps</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Child Protective Investigator Supervisors will be trained on ensuring that the CPI’s are documenting this information in the recommended section as well as in the chronological notes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy I: If documentation reflects the need for immediate services and/or ongoing supervision, the investigation record will contain evidence the services were engaged.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Steps</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The CPIS needs to ensure that the PI has contacted the service provider to make certain that the family is receiving the necessary services. The CPIS will ensure that this is done at the 72 hour review as well as the 30 day review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Investigator Supervisors will ensure that background checks are in the file at the time that the 72 hour review is conducted. If they are not in the file, the Supervisor will return the file to the CPI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy J: When there is an active services case when the report was received, timely and appropriate communication and collaboration between the CPI and Case Manager will occur to assure mutual understanding of history and current events.
### Action Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Office and Lead Person Responsible</th>
<th>Evidence of Completion</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The CPIS and CPI will continue to work on building a rapport with the Case Managers. The CPIS will ensure that the CPI has documented efforts to contact the Case Managers when they are completing the 72 hour review.</td>
<td>Child Protective Investigator Supervisor</td>
<td>QA results and periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategy K:** The Results Determination (closure options) documented in the automated information system will be the appropriate choice based on the information obtained during the investigation. *(Results Determination)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Office and Lead Person Responsible</th>
<th>Evidence of Completion</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Child Protective Investigator Supervisor will review the January 4, 2010 memo from the Quality Assurance office with each CPI.</td>
<td>Child Protective Investigator Supervisors</td>
<td>QA results and periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>2/26/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal 2: The Child Protective Investigator will complete all documentation in accordance with Florida Chapter 39 to successfully fulfill the requirements of an emergency removal.

**Strategy A:** The investigation file will contain a completed ICWA Eligibility Form. *(Indian Child Welfare Act)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Office and Lead Person Responsible</th>
<th>Evidence of Completion</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The CPIS will ensure that the ICWA eligibility form is in the file prior to case closure.</td>
<td>Child Protective Investigator Supervisor</td>
<td>QA results and periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy B: If the child was removed and placed in a licensed home or with a relative or non-relative caregiver, a Child Health Check-Up will be completed within 72 hours of removal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Office and Lead Person Responsible</th>
<th>Evidence of Completion</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The CPIS will ensure that the CPI’s are documenting attempts to have the physical completed.</td>
<td>Child Protective Investigator Supervisor</td>
<td>QA results and periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy C: If the Child Health Check-Up was not completed within 72 hours of the child’s removal, the Child Health Check-Up will be completed at some point thereafter and a copy of the form placed in the investigation file.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Office and Lead Person Responsible</th>
<th>Evidence of Completion</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The CPIS will ensure that a copy of the EPSDT is in the file prior to case closure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Office and Lead Person Responsible</th>
<th>Evidence of Completion</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Child Protective Investigator Supervisors will ensure that the Emergency Intake Form is in the file prior to case closure</td>
<td>Child Protective Investigator Supervisors</td>
<td>QA results and periodic reviews by Program Administrator</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Overall % Achieved March 2010</td>
<td>Overall % Achieved September 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Required background checks were completed timely and the information was appropriately used to assess risk to each child.</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Background checks were completed on all household members and report subjects age 12 and older.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Prior Reports to the Florida Abuse Hotline</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) for household members ages 12-26</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Local Law Enforcement</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4 Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5 Department of Corrections</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.6 Child Welfare Out of State (if the record reflects the family resided in another state)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.7 Prior Case Management Records</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.8 911 Calls or Calls for Service</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.9 Other (may include sexual predator listings, military disciplinary and family advocacy records, or National Crime Information Center (NCIC), when a household member has resided out of state)</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Background checks were completed within the established timeframes on all household members and report subjects age 12 and older.</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Information obtained from the background checks was used to assess safety, risk, and service needs for each child.</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Diligent attempts were made at least daily when a 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 attempts (daily and at varying locations and times of the day) are required until all child victims are seen.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 All &quot;other&quot; children named in the report and/or residing in the home were seen timely.</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 An interview was conducted and addressed all maltreatments with the alleged child victim(s) and &quot;other&quot; child(ren) named in the report and/or residing in the home.</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Interviews with child victim(s).</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Interviews with &quot;other&quot; child(ren).</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Interviews that addressed all maltreatments were conducted with the mother, father, other caregiver and alleged caretaker responsible (alleged perpetrator, if other than the mother or father), and other adult household members.</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Interview with mother</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>% Complete</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Interview with father</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Interview with alleged caretaker responsible (if not the mother or father)</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Interviews with other adult household members</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Observations and interactions of the children with family members were completed and documented during the course of the investigation.</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 The safety assessment process was completed with sufficient thoroughness to identify risks and develop a safety plan if needed.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 The initial safety assessment was completed with sufficient thoroughness to identify risks.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 The updated safety assessment(s) was completed with sufficient thoroughness to identify risks and accurately reflected information obtained during the course of the investigation.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 The safety plan, when needed, must be sufficient and identify the immediate and long term actions required to keep the child safe from harm.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 The safety plan was documented in FSFN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 The CPI Supervisor identified appropriate indicators requiring the completion of a second party review and a quality review was completed.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Relevant collateral contacts were completed during the course of the investigation.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Pertinent information was obtained from the collateral contacts and was considered when assessing the overall safety of the child and/or the need for services.</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Consideration of other professionals' assessment findings and recommendations in the determination of child safety and ongoing protective interventions was documented in the case file.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 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.</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1 A Children's Legal Services staffing was held when warranted.</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2 A dependency petition was filed or a valid reason for not pursuing a dependency action was documented, when the CLS staffing documented legal sufficiency.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 The alleged child victim(s) was referred to the Child Protection Team (CPT) and the referral was made timely when required.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1 A referral was made to the Child Protection Team (CPT) when required.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2 The referral was timely.</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The date, time, and specific information discussed with the Child Protection Team (CPT) at the time of initial referral were documented in the investigation file.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CPT assessment findings and recommendations related to child safety were followed or the rationale for not following the assessment and recommendations was documented.</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>When the report met mandatory Child Protection Team referral criteria and a face-to-face medical evaluation was not done, the case file documented the supervisor approved the exception decision.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>BLANK - Standard Deleted in 2010</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>All maltreatment findings were supported by the information gathered and appropriately documented in the investigative record.</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>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 (CBC) should provide family preservation services that would allow the child to remain safely in the home.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>Child (Not restricted to focus child or child identified as the victim in the abuse hotline report)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>Other Caregiver or Caretaker Responsible (if other than the mother or farther and has access or ongoing contact with the child)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>If immediate services or ongoing supervision was needed, referrals for these services were documented for the child, mother, father and other caregiver or caretaker responsible (if other than the mother or father).</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>Child (Not restricted to focus child or child identified as the victim in the abuse hotline report).</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>Other Caregiver or Caretaker Responsible (if someone other than the mother or father and has access or ongoing contact with the child)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>If documentation reflects the need for immediate services and/or ongoing supervision, the investigation record contained evidence the services were engaged.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 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.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 The investigation was thorough and appropriate steps were taken to ensure child safety.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 The case file documents the CPI's discussion with the parents or legal custodian to determine if they are of American Indian or Native Alaskan descent.</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Appropriate supervisory guidance and direction were provided and ensured a thorough investigation was completed.</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.1 Initial supervisory guidance</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.2 On-going supervisory guidance</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.3 Ongoing supervisor guidance</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Follow through occurred on the supervisory guidance and direction provided, or there was documentation it was no longer necessary.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.1 The CPI followed through on the supervisory guidance and direction.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.2 The CPI supervisor ensured CPI followed through on supervisory guidance and direction provided or the reason (s) the guidance and direction provided was no longer necessary was documented.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.3 The CPI supervisor ensured the CPI followed through on the 2nd party reviewer guidance and direction, or documented justification actions were no longer necessary.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 When the investigation was being closed, the case file reflects 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.</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Prior to the removal, the CPI made concerted efforts to provide appropriate services that would allow the child to remain safely in his/her own home.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 The investigation file documented compliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) through timely initiation of the search process, completing the required ICWA eligibility form, and by notifying the court when required.</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.1 The investigation file contained a completed ICWA Eligibility form.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.2 The ICWA checklist was completed if the child was reported to be a member of a tribe or was eligible to be a member of a tribe.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>If American Indian or Native Alaskan descent was claimed, the search process was initiated timely by contacting the designated tribe or Bureau of Indian Affairs.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>The court was informed when a child was determined to be a member of a tribe or eligible to be a member.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Once the decision was made to remove the child, placement priority was given to responsible relatives/non-relatives rather than licensed care.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>When the CPI placed the child with relatives or non-relatives, the case file contained evidence of required background checks and a physical inspection of the home prior to the child's placement.</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>The required background checks were completed during the home study process prior to the child's placement.</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.1</td>
<td>Prior abuse reports</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.2</td>
<td>Department of Juvenile Justice (ages 12-26)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.3</td>
<td>Local Law Enforcement</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.4</td>
<td>Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.5</td>
<td>NCIC</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.6</td>
<td>Department of Corrections</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.7</td>
<td>Child Welfare Out of State (if the record reflects the family resided in another state)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.8</td>
<td>Prior case management records</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.9</td>
<td>Other (for example, military records or 911 service calls, as needed)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1.10</td>
<td>Other (for example, military records as needed)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>A physical inspection of the home was completed during the home study process prior to the child's placement.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>An evaluation of the prospective caregiver's capacity to protect was completed during the home study process prior to the child's placement.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>The completed home study was documented in FSFN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>If removal involved a sibling group, the siblings were placed together with a relative or non-relative caregiver (not in licensed care) when it was in their best interest.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>If the child was removed and placed in a licensed home or with a relative or non-relative caregiver, a Child Health Check-Up was completed within 72 hours of removal.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>The Child Health Check-Up was completed within 72 hours of the child's removal and a copy is in the case file.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>If the Child Health Check-Up was not completed within 72 hours of the child’s removal, the Child Health Check-Up was completed at some point thereafter and a copy was in the case file.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 The Emergency Intake Form was completed and accurately identified the current medical information, including prescribed medicines, and/or needs of the child as known by the parent, guardian or legal custodian.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 If the removed child was prescribed psychotropic medications prior to case responsibility being transferred to the case management agency, the CPI obtained written authorization from the parents to continue administration where appropriate and properly initiated the process to obtain written express and informed consent by the parents, or where necessary, a court order.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 The CPI visited the child in shelter care on a weekly basis until the case was transferred to and accepted by the CBC provider who subsequently agreed to conduct the required visits.</td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>