Circuit 8 Supervisory Mentoring and Modeling Quality Review Findings – 1st Discretionary Review 2010/2011

Overall Score: 77%
# of Supervisors: 6
# of Supervisory Discussions Observed: 12

Note: The percentages are based on the percent of the total possible score achieved. For example, Circuit 8 had 12 supervisory sessions. Each standard allows for a total score of two points, and with 12 sessions reviewed the total possible score is 24 points.

1.0 Supervisor demonstrates mentoring and fosters critical thinking during qualitative discussions.
1.1 Demonstrates flexibility in information gathering: 100%
1.2 Uses open-ended questions: 100%
1.3 Uses critical thinking prompts: 29%
1.4 Probes to uncover detailed information and insights: 83%

Strengths: The 12 supervisory sessions fully complied in demonstrating flexibility in information gathering and the use of open-ended questions. The use of probing questions was also observed in nine of the supervisory sessions.

Opportunities: Seven of the twelve supervisory sessions did not document the use of critical thinking prompts when the opportunity presented, and three sessions documented partial compliance. The use of critical thinking prompts is particularly important with new hires, but also beneficial with all staff. Critical thinking prompts include gently challenging the conclusion, position, plan or direction the CPI articulates. Taking the time to do this, regardless of whether the supervisor agrees, helps staff build the skills needed to support their conclusions or proposed plans, and encourages the CPI to consider alternatives.

2.0 Supervisor ensures qualitative discussion is appropriately focused on the current status of the investigation.
2.1 Explores history and cultural background of the family: 86%
2.2 Explores the quality and appropriateness of contacts addressed: 67%
**Strengths:** Eight supervisory sessions documented full compliance with exploring the history and cultural background of the family. Three supervisory sessions documented partial compliance, and in one session exploration of the family’s history and cultural background was not applicable.

**Opportunities:** One supervisory session did not explore the quality and appropriateness of contacts addressed, and six supervisory sessions documented only partial compliance.

3.0 Supervisor ensures the current assessment of child safety is consistent with the risk factors.

3.1 Explores the background check results and the potential impact on child safety: 67%
3.2 Explores the prior abuse reports and patterns of behavior documented: 88%
3.3 Explores each parent’s/caregiver’s history of being abused as a child and the potential impact on child safety: 58%
3.4 Explores CPI’s observations that elevated or reduced risk: 82%
3.5 Explores whether a safety plan is warranted: 94%

**Strengths:** Ten of the supervisory sessions documented full compliance in exploring prior abuse reports and the patterns of behavior documented. Seven of the 12 supervisory sessions also documented full compliance in exploring the CPI’s observations that elevated or reduced risk. In seven of the twelve applicable supervisory sessions the reviewer observed discussion about whether a safety plan was needed.

**Opportunities:** Quality assurance reviews have consistently documented deficiencies in documenting evidence all required background checks were completed, so it is important for supervisors to prioritize this issue when conducting supervisory reviews with the CPI and when reviewing investigation records for closure. One supervisory review failed to explore the background check results and the impact on child safety. Six of the twelve supervisory sessions documented only partial compliance with exploring background checks. Four of the twelve applicable sessions documented partial compliance in exploring the parent’s/caregiver’s history of being abused as a child, and three supervisory sessions failed to address the parent’s/caregiver’s history of being abused as a child.

4.0 Supervisor reinforces family centered practice in the qualitative discussion through exploring the CPI’s efforts.

4.1 Engages both parents (including non-custodial) during the course of the investigation: 83%
4.2 Explores the family’s strengths and needs: 71%
4.3 Involves the family in identifying their strengths and needs discussed: 29%
4.4. Initiates service referrals consistent with identified needs: 92%
4.5 Confirms service engagement: 100%

**Strengths:** Nine of the 12 supervisory sessions documented both parents were engaged or if early in the investigation supervisory direction was given to engage the parents, including a non-custodial parent, during the course of the investigation. The reviewer also looked for evidence the supervisor addressed the key components of family centered practice through exploring the CPI’s efforts to address the presenting concerns in an honest and open manner. The failure to engage both parents is frequently cited as a concern in both federal and local quality assurance reviews, so these results are encouraging. In 10 of the 12 supervisory sessions, full compliance was noted in initiating service referrals consistent with the identified needs, and eight of the applicable sessions documented confirmation services were engaged.

**Opportunities:** Seven supervisory sessions documented partial achievement in seven supervisory sessions exploring the family’s strengths and needs. Five of the supervisory sessions failed to address the CPI’s efforts to involve the family in identifying their strengths and needs, while seven sessions documented only partial compliance. The partial scores were in part related to the discussion focusing on needs rather than strengths. Improvement in this area is critical to fully implementing family centered practice. Supervision provides an opportunity to explore how the CPI engaged the parent in participating in the discussion, and to provide direction on the importance of documenting this information in the case record. Case records typically reflect identified strengths and needs, but rarely address the degree to which the family members participated in the identification of these strengths and needs.

5.0 **Supervisor ensures appropriate guidance, direction, and follow-up.**
5.1 Addresses the status of follow through on prior guidance and direction (supervisory and second party reviews): 82%
5.2 Provides appropriate guidance and direction based on the information discussed: 88%

**Strengths:** Eight of the eleven applicable supervisory sessions addressed follow through on the prior guidance and direction provided by the supervisor and/or second party reviewer. Nine of the twelve sessions also fully achieved the requirement to provide appropriate guidance, direction, and follow-up.
Opportunities: Partial achievement was documented for one of the supervisory sessions in addressing follow through on the prior guidance and direction provided by the supervisor and/or second party reviewer, in part due to needed guidance and direction not being provided. Partial achievement was noted in three of the 12 sessions in providing appropriate guidance and direction. Follow up on supervisory guidance and direction is frequently cited as a deficiency in quality assurance reviews.

6.0 Supervisor explores the child’s safety and well-being in investigations involving a removal and placement with relatives or non-relative caregiver.
6.1 Explore whether the child’s placement maintains important connections: 75%
6.2 Explores the child’s needs and the caregiver’s capacity to meet the child’s physical, emotional, and behavioral needs: 50%
6.3 Determines if the investigation file documents the required background checks and a physical inspection of the home was completed prior to placement: 100%
6.4 Determines the investigation file contains a completed Emergency Intake form: 100%
6.5 Determines the investigation file contains a copy of the completed medical diagnostic screening: 75%

Strengths: The investigations reviewed involved two removal episodes. Full compliance was achieved in the two applicable supervisory reviews through verifying the investigation file documented completed required background checks and a physical inspection of the home prior to placement. Full compliance was also achieved in determining the investigation file contained a completed Emergency Intake form.

Opportunities: One of the two applicable supervisory reviews did not explore the child’s needs and the caregiver’s capacity to meet the child’s physical, emotional, and behavioral needs. Partial compliance was documented in one of the two applicable supervisory reviews in exploring whether the child’s placement maintained important connections and determining if the investigation file contained a copy of the completed medical diagnostic screening.
Circuit Comparison Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring and Modeling Review</th>
<th>Circuit 3</th>
<th>Circuit 8</th>
<th>Circuit 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Standard</strong></td>
<td>Prior Review 71%</td>
<td>Current Review 76%</td>
<td>Prior Review 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The supervisor demonstrates mentoring and fosters critical thinking during the qualitative discussion through:</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Demonstrating flexibility in information gathering?</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Using open-ended questions?</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Using critical thinking prompts?</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Probing to uncover detailed information and insights?</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The supervisor ensures the qualitative discussion is appropriately focused on the current status of the investigation through:</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Exploring the history and cultural background of the family? (1.1)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Exploring the quality and appropriateness of contacts addressed? (1.4, 1.5, 1.9)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The supervisor ensures the current assessment of child safety is consistent with the risk factors through:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.1 Exploring the background check results and the potential impact on child safety? (1.1, 1.10, 1.18) | 69% | 94% | 80% | 67% | 78% | 94%
3.2 Exploring the prior abuse reports and patterns of behavior documented? (1.1) | 81% | 100% | 78% | 88% | 80% | 84%
3.3 Exploring each parent's/caregiver's history of being abused as a child and the potential impact on child safety? (1.1) | 58% | 50% | 50% | 58% | 31% | 48%
3.4 Exploring the CPI's observations that elevated or reduced risk? (1.6) | 69% | 88% | 80% | 82% | 85% | 81%
3.5 Exploring whether a safety plan was warranted? (1.7) | 83% | 100% | 68% | 94% | 82% | 85%

4. The supervisor reinforces family centered practice in the qualitative discussion through exploring the CPI's efforts to:

4.1 Engage both parents (including non-custodial) during the course of the investigation? (1.5, 1.9) | 88% | 57% | 88% | 83% | 90% | 80%
4.2 Explore the family's strengths and needs? (1.11, 1.15) | 63% | 88% | 67% | 71% | 90% | 74%
4.3 Involve the family in identifying their strengths and needs discussed? (1.20) | 13% | 25% | 5% | 29% | 60% | 28%
4.4 Initiate service referrals consistent with identified needs? (1.21) | 69% | 100% | 80% | 92% | 88% | 95%
4.5 Confirm service engagement? (1.19, 1.22) | 100% | 100% | 75% | 100% | 78% | 100%

5. The supervisor ensures appropriate guidance, direction and follow up through:
5.1 Addressing the status of follow through on prior guidance and direction (supervisory and second party reviews)? (1.8, 1.27) | 93% | 29% | 72% | 82% | 69% | 81%  
5.2 Providing appropriate guidance and direction based on the information discussed? (1.26) | 81% | 100% | 92% | 88% | 92% | 94%  
6. The supervisor explored the child’s safety and well-being in investigations involving a removal and placement with relatives or non-relatives through: |  |  |  |  |  |  
6.1 Exploring if the child's placement maintained important connections, e.g. siblings, prior relationship with relative or non-relative caregiver? (2.5) | NA | NA | NA | 75% | NA | 80%  
6.2 Exploring the child's needs and the caregiver's capacity to meet the child's physical, emotional and behavioral needs? | NA | NA | NA | 50% | NA | 67%  
6.3 Determining if the investigation file documented the required background checks and a physical inspection of the home were completed prior to placement? (2.1 and 2.4) | NA | NA | NA | 100% | NA | 83%  
6.4 Determining the investigation file contained a completed Emergency Intake form? (2.7) | NA | NA | NA | 100% | NA | 0%  
6.5 Determining the investigation file contained a copy of the completed medical diagnostic screening? (2.6.2) | NA | NA | NA | 75% | NA | 50%