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Underlying Principle

All staff must understand each person has a role in quality assurance. Everyone must be responsible for taking immediate action when there is any evidence the life, safety, or health of a child may be threatened. Whether the evidence is observed in the field, identified through formal QA review, or heard in an interview or other discussion with knowledgeable case participants or stakeholders, personal integrity and responsibility require action.

Scoring Rubric

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.

- Scenario: CPI investigates domestic violence allegations involving a family that recently relocated from another state.

- Although closed with “not substantiated” or “no indicator” findings, the CPI did not document a Child Welfare Out of State check or an out of state local law enforcement check, and it was ultimately determined the investigation did not meet legal sufficiency to file a petition.

- The family was offered and agreed to participate in a domestic violence program and/or in-home non-judicial services.

- If the reviewer believes the intervention was appropriate, despite the omission of these requirements, (that is, the out-of-state checks) this standard should be assessed as Mostly Achieved.

5 Requirement Partially Achieved

- The specific requirements of the review element were met with some significant discrepancies or omissions.

- In the same scenario, the CPI documented an incident did occur in Florida, but the CPI did not document a Child Welfare Out of State check or an out of state local law enforcement check. The CPI closed the investigation after staffing it with CLS where it
was determined the investigation did not meet legal sufficiency to pursue court ordered supervision, and the family declined services.

- The completion of the above identified checks may have confirmed the Florida incident was not isolated and provided more evidence to deem the scenario legally sufficient.

- 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.

- If the reviewer believes the assessment of risk and child safety, and the disposition of the investigation were negatively impacted, this standard should be assessed as Partially Achieved.

0 Requirement Not Achieved

- The specific requirements of the review element were not met.

Reminder

Always refer back to the Scoring Rubric when making a rating choice of “7” or “5”.
**FACE SHEET**

Family Last Name __________ Intake#______ County/Unit_____________

Investigator _______________ Supervisor _______ Date Received_______

Date Closed ______________ # of Prior Investigations _________________

# of Alleged Victims ________ Age of Youngest Alleged Victim ________

Emergency Removal

Ethnicity of Youngest Alleged Victim _____________________

Most Serious Alleged Maltreatment _____________________

Finding of Most Serious Alleged Maltreatment ________________

Alleged Perpetrator Type _____________________

Reporter Type _____________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Was there an open case management case at the time the Investigation was received?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Was family receiving community services at the time the Investigation was received?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Did any prior reports allege the same general concerns?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Did any prior reports allege the same perpetrator (s)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Did the same reporter report the family multiple times?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Are there immediate or ongoing safety concerns based on review? (If so, provide Request for Action form.)</td>
<td><strong>Immediate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emergency Removal?  

---

Office of Family Safety  
Florida Department of Children and Families  
Fiscal Year 2010/2011 Version 1
Background Checks

1.0 Required background checks were completed timely and the information was appropriately used to assess risk to each child.

1.1 Background checks were completed on all household members and report subjects age 12 and older.

- Prior Reports to the Florida Abuse Hotline;
- Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) for household members ages 12-26;
- Local Law Enforcement;
- Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE);
- Department of Corrections.
- Child Welfare Out of State (if the record reflects the family resided in another state);
- Prior Case Management Records;
- 911 Calls or Calls for Service; and
- 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).

Requirements: The CPI is required to determine the immediate and long-term risk to each child by conducting background checks on the parents, legal custodians or caregivers, and any other persons in the household.

The CPI must review all of the information in prior reports to the Florida Abuse Hotline, not just the findings of prior investigations. Supporting documentation of completed checks must be maintained in the case file with sufficient detail to ensure available information was obtained. A DJJ check will be accepted for children age 12 to 18 in lieu of a local delinquency criminal history check.

Instructions and Considerations: Thorough background and record checks provide information on individual or family issues and may identify behavioral patterns that could create a safety risk to the child or affect family functioning. The reviewer must assess if the information obtained through these checks appropriately drove investigative decision-making and determine if there was an increase in the seriousness or frequency of background history over time that the CPI did or did not recognize.

The extent of criminal background information required to facilitate a thorough assessment may differ slightly in some investigations and the reviewer must determine if the information collected suffices to address safety and risks. For instance, a 911 call history or local “calls for service” on reports alleging serious abuse, neglect, domestic violence, and/or substance abuse should be completed by the CPI. However, for less serious allegations, the reviewer must determine if this specific check would have made a significant difference in assessing child safety.

If a thorough background check was not completed on all household members based on the above logic and rationale, the reviewer may rate the requirement as mostly or partially achieved using professional and reasonable judgment.
Rating:

✔ Document “9” if the specific requirements of this review element were met.

✔ Document “7” if the specific requirements of this review element were met with some deficiencies or omissions, as long as the deficiencies or omissions did not impact the safety decisions or the outcome of the investigation.

✔ Document “5” if the specific requirements of the review element were met with some deficiencies or omissions, and the deficiencies or omissions could impact the safety decisions or outcome of the investigation.

✔ Document “0” if none of the specific requirements of this review element were met.

1.2 Background checks were completed within the established timeframes on all household members and report subjects age 12 and older.

Instructions and Considerations: Assessing the timeliness within which background checks were requested and reviewed by the CPI is important to show the information was considered throughout the course of the investigation. The date the background check was requested and obtained should be clearly documented in the case file. If the required record check was completed timely (from the date of determining the demographics on the subjects, the check was completed within 24 hours for prior abuse reports and within 72 hours for criminal histories), the requirement would be fully achieved. If done later in the process, the rating would be mostly or partially achieved depending on the thoroughness of the background check. The reviewer should specifically identify the checks completed timely, untimely or not completed at all.

Note: Rate the response based on evidence if the responses were delayed for reasons beyond the CPI’s control.

Rating:

✔ Document “9” if the specific requirements of the review element were met (i.e., from the date of determining the demographics on the subjects, the check was completed within 24 hours for prior abuse reports and within 72 hours for criminal histories).

✔ Document “7” if the specific requirements of the review element were met with some deficiencies, as long as the deficiencies or omissions did not impact the safety decisions or the outcome of the investigation.

✔ Document “5” if the specific requirements of the review element were met, but with significant omissions that could impact the safety decisions or outcome of the case.

✔ Document “0” if none of the specific requirements of the review element were met.
1.3 **Information obtained from the background checks was used to assess safety, risk, and service needs for each child.**

**Requirements:** The reviewer must consider how the information obtained was applied to the assessment of safety, risk, and service needs. Additional inquiries and information on arrests or convictions related to serious crimes should be documented in the case file.

**Instructions and Considerations:** The reviewer must determine if the necessary information was gathered during the assessment process, and if the information was used to make overall child safety decisions. Some factors that should impact decisions related to assessment of child safety include: multiple reports of abuse and neglect involving the same perpetrator or same type of maltreatment; reports documenting prior or current domestic violence; ongoing substance abuse and/or mental health concerns; or any combination thereof. The reviewer should also consider how the CPI used the background history of frequent visitors and paramours to assess safety, risk, and service needs.

**Rating:**

- ✓ Document “9” if the case file documents necessary information was gathered and used to assess child safety and make safety decisions.
- ✓ Document “7” or “5” if the case file contained some but not all needed information or some but not all of the information was appropriately used to assess child safety and make safety decisions.
- ✓ Document “0” if needed information was not gathered or not considered in assessing child safety and making safety decisions.

**Reference:** s. 39.301(9) (b) 3, F.S. & 65C-29.003 (j), & 65C-29.009, F.A.C., Safety Outcome 1, Item 4 & Policy Directive, April 21, 2008 – Calls for Service During Investigations, ACFF-CB-PI-10-02, March 26, 2010
Diligent Attempts to See Child Victims

2.0 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.

Requirements: The CPI is required to make unannounced, on-site, face-to-face contact with all child victims within 24 hours of the time the report was taken by the Hotline. If the first attempt to contact the child victim was unsuccessful, the case file should document continued diligent attempts to contact the child victim. 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.

Instructions/Considerations: The purpose of the initial contact is to assess the child’s safety and begin an assessment of the family’s strengths and needs. The reviewer must assess compliance with the requirement for the ongoing diligent attempts to see the child victims. The reviewer must consider whether the case file documents the counselor went to the address listed on the report, as well as other possible locations, at different times of the day. Additional efforts may include re-contacting the reporter to verify the address or contacting relatives, school personnel or law enforcement to assist in the efforts to locate the child. Written evidence of diligent efforts may include copies of contact letters or chronological notes documenting the inquiries and attempts made to locate the child victims.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the case file documented diligent efforts, consistent with the requirements outlined above, were made to see all child victims not seen in the first 24 hours.

✓ Document “7” if diligent attempts occurred daily but did not include all possible locations, did not address all child victims not seen in the first 24 hours, or did not occur at varying locations and times of the day, as long as the deficiencies or omissions did not impact the safety decisions or the outcome of the investigation.

✓ Document “5” if some diligent attempts occurred daily but did not include all possible locations, did not address all child victims not seen in the first 24 hours, or did not occur at varying locations and times of the day, and the deficiencies or omissions could impact the safety decisions or outcome of the investigation.

✓ Document “0” if insufficient or no diligent attempts were made.

✓ Document “NA” if all child victims were seen within 24 hours of the report being accepted by the Hotline.

Reference: s. 39.201(5) F.S. & 65C-29.013 (2) (a), F.A.C., Safety Outcome 1, Item 1
Seeing Children Timely

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

Requirements: All “other” children residing in the home must be seen in a timely manner.

Instructions and Considerations: The CPI must see all children in the household, not just those listed as victims in the report, in order to assess risk and ensure safety. The nature of the allegations and the ages of the children and proximity to the alleged perpetrator must be considered when determining whether the response was “timely”. Timeliness must be based on the risk to the “other children” and how quickly they were seen in order to ensure safety.

Additional Guidance: Daily diligent efforts are not required to see “other” children named in the report; safety factors are the driving force. In addition, on-site visits and face-to-face interviews with the child, other siblings, other children in the home and family shall be unannounced unless it is determined by the Department, the sheriff’s office, or contract service provider that an unannounced visit would threaten the safety of the child.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if based on the criteria described above all of the “other” children named in the report or residing in the home were seen within 24 hours.

✓ Document “7” if all of the “other” children were seen beyond 24 hours, but was considered timely by the reviewer and did not impact the safety decisions or the outcome of the investigation.

✓ Document “5” if all of the “other” children were seen but not timely and the deficiencies or omissions could impact the safety decisions or outcome of the investigation.

✓ Document “0” if only some or none of the “other” children were seen before report closure.

✓ Document “NA” if there were no “other” children or the “other” children were on runaway, out of state, in another county, or deceased.

Reference: s. 39.301 F.S. & 65C-29.003 (3) (b-d), F.A.C.
Interviewing Children

4.0 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.

4.1 Interviews with child victim(s).

Requirements: An assessment must include a face-to-face interview with all of the alleged child victims, addressing each alleged maltreatment, and include a determination if the victim children were abused, abandoned or neglected.

Instructions and Considerations: The CPI must document that face-to-face interviews were conducted and all allegations were addressed. Timeliness should not be considered when assessing compliance with this review element. For children three years of age or with special needs, the CPI must document efforts to conduct an interview or an assessment of the child’s verbal capacity.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” when age appropriate for each child victim there was an interview in relation to each maltreatment.

✓ Document “7” or “5” if all maltreatments were not addressed or all victims were not interviewed regarding the maltreatments, depending on the degree of compliance.

✓ Document “7” or “5” if all maltreatments were not addressed or all children were not interviewed regarding the maltreatments considering if the child refused to be interviewed, was uncooperative, or defiant to the extent the CPI had to conclude an attempted interview.

✓ Document “0” if there was no documentation the child victims were interviewed and/or no attempts were made (for children who are verbal and/or cooperative).

✓ Document “NA” if child was non-verbal.

4.2 Interviews with “other” child(ren).

Requirements: An assessment must include a face-to-face interview with all of the “other” children, addressing each maltreatment, and include a determination regarding whether the “other” children were abused, abandoned or neglected.

Instructions and Considerations: The CPI must document face-to-face interviews were conducted and all allegations were addressed with “other” children named in the report. Timeliness should not be considered when assessing compliance with interviewing “other” children. For children three years of age or with special needs, the CPI must document efforts to conduct an interview or an assessment of the child’s verbal capacity.
Rating:

✓ Document “9” when age appropriate for each “other” child there was an interview in relation to each maltreatment.

✓ Document “7” or “5” if all “other children” were not interviewed regarding all of the maltreatments, depending on the degree of compliance.

✓ Document “7” or “5” if all “other children” were not interviewed regarding the maltreatments considering if the child refused to be interviewed, was uncooperative, or defiant to the extent the CPI had to conclude the attempted interview.

✓ Document “0” if there was no documentation the “other children” were interviewed and/or no attempts were made (for children who were verbal and/or cooperative).

✓ Document N/A if no “other children” were involved.

Reference: ss. 39.301 (11) (b); (10) (a-b), F.S., Safety Outcome 2, Item 4
**Interviews with Caregivers**

**5.0 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.**

- Interview with mother;
- Interview with father;
- Interview with alleged caretaker responsible (if not the mother or father); and
- Interviews with other adult household members.

**Requirements:** The CPI’s assessment of child safety must include face-to-face interviews with the parents and other adults in the household. The CPI is required to conduct and document a face-to-face interview that addresses all alleged maltreatments with all adult subjects of the report and all adult household members residing in the home.

**Instructions and Considerations:** The interviews should be conducted face-to-face. The reviewer should be able to discern the roles of all household members from the case file, and the adult household members’ attitudes toward the child victim(s) and “other” children in the home should be well documented. Timeliness is not a factor when assessing compliance with this element. If one of the parents is non-custodial and/or does not reside in the child’s household, this individual should be contacted as a relevant collateral source and addressed under standard 9 collateral contacts.

**Rating:**

- ✓ Document “9” if all adult subjects of the report and all adult household members were interviewed regarding all of the alleged maltreatments.
- ✓ Document “7” or “5” if all of the alleged maltreatments were not addressed or all adult subjects and household members were not interviewed, depending on the degree of compliance and impact on child safety.
- ✓ Document “0” if the case file documented no interviews were conducted or attempted with all of the adult subjects of the report and all adult household members.
- ✓ Document “NA” if interviews were attempted, and the adult subject or adult household member refused to answer questions, an attorney or law enforcement prohibited contact with the alleged perpetrator or diligent efforts were made and the adult could not be contacted.
- ✓ Document “NA” if the mother, father, or alleged caretaker responsible did not live in the home and were not a subject of the report.

**References:** ss. 39.301(9) (b); (10) (b) & (11) (b), F.S., Safety Outcome 2, Item 4
Observations and Interactions of the Children

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

Requirements: The CPI must determine whether there is any indication a child in the family or household was abused, abandoned or neglected, and the nature and extent of present or prior injuries.

Instructions and Considerations: The CPI must observe the child’s interaction with his/her family, the alleged perpetrator or caregiver responsible, as well as, all “other” children in the household. The degree of documentation may differ slightly depending on the elements of the investigation and the age of the victims; however, interactions between the child and subjects of the report should be observed and relevant to the alleged maltreatment(s).

Additional Guidance: The CPI is required to document specific and relevant observations of the children during the investigation that include, but are 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 the children and relevant parent/child interactions given the alleged maltreatment(s). Observations documented in the case file should give the reviewer 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.

Rating:

- Document “9” if specific and relevant interactions observed between child(ren) and other household members were relevant to the alleged maltreatment(s), observed and documented in the case file, and included observations of each child’s physical appearance, developmental progress, and behavior.

- Document “7” or “5” if the CPI documented specific and relevant interactions and observations of some but not all of the children. Carefully consider the range between “7” or “5” relative to the seriousness of the alleged maltreatment.

- Document “5” if the documented interactions or observations lacked relevance to the alleged maltreatment(s) or specificity such as, “child was sleeping,” victim and/or “other” children were only seen at school.

- Document “0” if the CPI did not document specific and relevant observations of any of the children in the home.

Reference: s. 39.301(10) (b), F.S.; & 65C-29.003(3) (c), F.A.C., Safety Outcome 2, Item 4
Safety Assessment/Safety Plan

7.0 The safety assessment process was completed with sufficient thoroughness to identify risks and develop a safety plan if needed.

Requirements: The CPI is required to determine the immediate and long-term risk to each child during the child safety assessment process, which includes documentation of the safety action.

Instructions and Considerations: The process and documentation should reflect information gathered through various means to support the need for the immediate safety action(s) taken. The overall safety assessment should be appropriate given all of the information gathered about the family, and the steps taken to ensure safety should appropriately address present danger, child vulnerability, and protective capacity implications.

Additional Guidance: The reviewer should review the safety actions planned and taken, and look for evidence the prior reports were fully considered during the assessment process. The reviewer should consider whether the CPI documented a review of the prior abuse and criminal history, accurately assessed child safety based on the family and child’s history and report allegations, and took appropriate steps. The reviewer should determine if the safety constructs were appropriately assessed and if the overall safety assessment justification was consistent with the facts known.

7.1 The initial safety assessment was completed with sufficient thoroughness to identify risks.

Requirements: Based on the information obtained from available sources, the CPI shall submit the automated assessment tool within 48 hours from the time the first child victim is seen and, if needed, develop a safety plan. The purpose of conducting the assessment within 48 hours is to determine whether a safety plan is necessary.

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer should look for evidence the prior reports were fully considered during the assessment process. If no contacts could be completed within the first 48 hours, the reviewer should consider whether the CPI documented a review of the prior abuse and criminal history, accurately assessed child safety based on the family and child’s history and report allegation, and took the appropriate steps.

Rating:

- ✓ Document “9” if the initial safety assessment was sufficiently thorough to identify risks, and if no contacts could be completed, the case file reflected the CPI documented a review of the prior abuse and criminal history, accurately assessed child safety based on the information available, and took the appropriate steps.

- ✓ Document “7” or “5” or “0” using professional and objective judgment to determine how thorough the initial assessment was, or was not, in identifying risk and addressing child safety.
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.

**Requirements:** An updated safety assessment is required when after initial contact with the child or any other subject of the report, when the initial contact occurs after the initial safety assessment submission; a determination is made about a child’s possible removal from the home; as often as necessary to ensure the child’s safety; when new information is received which may impact child safety; when circumstances change within the child’s environment; prior to developing recommendations to the court for disposition in cases considered for judicial action; and prior to closing the investigation.

**Rating:**

✓ Document “9” if the updated safety assessment was appropriate and the steps taken to ensure child safety addressed the implications for child safety.

✓ Document “7” or “5” using professional and objective judgment to determine the thoroughness of the assessment, and the effectiveness of the safety actions.

✓ Document “0” if the updated safety assessment was not required on an onsite child protective investigation.

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.

**Requirements:** Safety plans must describe safety concerns that would pose immediate or serious harm or threats of harm. The CPI must consider all factors that pertain to child vulnerabilities, protective capacities, and signs of immediate or emerging danger. The safety plan must describe the specific actions to be taken. Plans shall be re-assessed, updated, and resubmitted to the CPI Supervisor for review and approval immediately upon determining a family’s protective capacities are not sufficient to manage immediate or serious harm threats and that it is necessary to control threats of serious harm or supplement a family’s protective capacities.

**Instructions and Considerations:** Safety plans should include appropriate, specific steps that will be taken to prevent further abuse/neglect and must go beyond a written pledge by the caretakers responsible or parents not to abuse/neglect the child again.

**Rating:**

✓ Document “9” when the safety plan accurately documented the immediate and long term actions required to keep the child safe from harm, and was reassessed, updated and resubmitted to the CPI Supervisor for review and approval when required.

✓ Document “7” or “5” when the safety plan accurately documented the immediate and long term actions required to keep the child safe from harm, but was not updated and resubmitted to the CPI Supervisor for review and approval when required, depending on the risk to child safety.
7.4 The safety plan was documented in FSFN.

**Requirements:** Safety plans are required to be completed and documented in the Florida Safe Families Network (FSFN).

**Instructions and Considerations:** The reviewer should look for evidence the safety plan was documented in the Florida Safe Families Network (FSFN).

**Rating:**

- Document “9” if the safety plan was documented in FSFN.
- Document “0” if the safety plan was not documented in FSFN.
- Document “NA” if a safety plan was not needed or “0” or “NA” was selected for sub standard 7.3.

**Reference:** ss. 39.301(9) (b) 5&6, F. S.; & 65C-29.003(5) (a), F.A.C., Safety Outcome 2, Item 4
Second Party Review

8.0 The CPI Supervisor identified appropriate indicators requiring the completion of a second party review and a quality review was completed.

Requirements: Second party reviews are required when the report documents one of the following criteria: when the caregiver or other household member is responsible for death or serious injury of another child; or any two of the following three criteria are met:

1) child is four years of age or younger or nonverbal;

2) there are prior reports involving any of the subjects in the current report regardless of finding; and/or

3) the actual injury, neglect, or threatened harm is serious or severe.

Instructions and Considerations: The purpose of the second party review is to examine the supervisor’s decision and either validate the supervisor’s recommended course of action or determine the need for alternative or additional action by the supervisor or the CPI. The reviewer must determine if a second party review was completed when required, based on the requirements documented above. The second party reviewer has seventy-two hours from receipt of the automated assessment tool to complete the second party review.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if a second party review was required, appropriately referred, and completed timely, and when needed documents appropriate second party review guidance and direction.

✓ Document “7” or “5” if the CPI did not document the appropriate factors and the investigation was not initially referred for a second party review, but received a second party review in a subsequent submission based on the supervisor’s directive, and/or the case file documented some but not all of the needed second party review guidance and direction were provided. Consideration should be given to guidance relative to child safety.

✓ Document “0” if a second party review was required and not completed.

✓ Document “NA” if a second party reviewer’s signature affirmed the supervisor’s decisions to date were appropriate and the case file documentation supported no further second party review guidance and direction were needed or required.

✓ Document “NA” if a second party review was not required.

References: 65C-29.003(6) (d), & 65C-30.001(124), F.A.C., CFSR Systemic Factor #31
Collateral Contacts

9.0  Relevant collateral contacts were completed during the course of the investigation.

Requirements: Relevant collateral contacts are necessary to assist the CPI in corroborating or refuting the allegations contained in the report. A specific number of contacts are not required, but the relevancy of completed collateral contacts is critical and should include the reporter. Note: if the child has a non-custodial parent who does not reside in the child’s household but is involved in the child’s life, this individual should be contacted as a collateral source.

Instructions and Considerations: Relevant collateral contacts are individuals who have contact with the child or otherwise have pertinent knowledge about the child, the child’s condition, and/or the alleged circumstances or maltreatment. This can include but is not limited to extended family members, family friends, non-custodial parent, service providers, school personnel, neighbors, and other community members who have direct knowledge or information regarding alleged maltreatments and the family’s situation. If collateral contacts were completed, but none were “relevant” to the situation, the standard is not met.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if relevant collateral contacts were made to provide needed corroboration or additional information regarding the report allegations.

✓ Document “7” if most of the completed collateral contacts were relevant.

✓ Document “5” if only some of the completed collateral contacts were relevant to the presenting concerns and additional contacts were warranted.

✓ Document “0” if no relevant collateral contacts were completed.

References: s. 39.301(11) (b) 2, F.S.; & 65C-29.003(9) & 30.001(28), F.A.C., Safety 2, Outcome 4
Obtaining Pertinent Information from Collaterals

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.**

**Requirements:** The CPI is required to document how the information obtained from collateral contacts was used in assessing the overall safety of the child and/or need for services and supervision.

**Instructions and Considerations:** The reviewer should assess whether pertinent information was obtained and considered in assessing child safety, identifying and addressing the service needs of the family, and determining the allegation findings and appropriate disposition. If comparable collateral contacts provided conflicting information, the case file should reflect the basis for considering one contact more credible than the other.

**Rating:**

- ✓ Document “9” if appropriate and pertinent information was obtained from relevant collateral contacts and it was appropriately used to assess the overall safety of the child, need for services, and investigative findings.
- ✓ Document “7” or “5” if some, but not all of the needed information was obtained from relevant collateral contacts, and was appropriately used to assess the safety of the child, need for services, and investigative findings.
- ✓ Document “0” if none of the right questions were asked or if the information was not used to assess the overall safety of the child and/or need for services and/or supervision.
- ✓ Document “NA” if review standard 9 documented no relevant collateral contacts were completed and was rated “0”.

**References:** s. 39.301(11) (b) 2, F.S.; & 65C-30.001(28) & 65C-29.003(9), F.A.C., Safety Outcome 2, Item 4
Professional Assessment of Others

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.**

**Requirements:** The CPI will carefully assess and take into consideration all professional opinions and recommendations received to make a determination regarding child safety and the need for ongoing protective interventions. The CPI should consider past or current assessments and evaluations requested and/or received during the current investigation from professionals in the fields of domestic violence, mental health, developmental disabilities, medical, behavioral or substance abuse services, or other specialized assessments/evaluations. **This does not apply to Child Protection Team (CPT) assessments/recommendations which are addressed in standard 15.**

**Instructions and Considerations:** The specific information and recommendations provided, as well as the date and time of any face-to-face or telephone contacts with the professionals shall be documented in the case file. All written documentation received from professionals should be included in the case file. If the findings or recommendation concern specific safety factors, the CPI will update the safety assessment. Other safety concerns and how the information received impacts the safety determination shall be documented in the case file and should be evident in maltreatment findings or report disposition/services decisions. If assessment findings or recommendations were not followed, the reason(s) should be documented in the case file.

**Rating:**

- ✓ Document “9” if the CPI documented and considered other professionals’ assessment(s) and recommendation(s) in the determination of child safety and the ongoing protective interventions needed.

- ✓ Document “7” or “5” if the CPI considered some of the professionals’ assessments and recommendations, and did not provide a rationale for not following all recommendations.

- ✓ Document “0” if no professionals’ assessments and recommendations were considered in the determination of child safety and ongoing protective interventions.

- ✓ Document “NA” if no professional assessments and recommendations were requested or received during the course of the investigation.

**Reference:** Department of Children and Families, Office of Family Safety, Best Practice, Well Being Outcome 1, Item 17
Children’s Legal Services (CLS) Staffing

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.

12.1 A Children’s Legal Services staffing was held when warranted.

**Requirement:** A CLS staffing is required when the investigation documents high-risk for child safety and the investigator believes the child is in need of the protection and supervision of the court. Factors that should be considered in determining whether a case is high-risk include, but are not limited to, the young age of the parents or legal custodians; the repeated use of illegal drugs; the arrest of the parents or legal custodians on charges of manufacturing, processing, disposing of, or storing, either temporarily or permanently, any substances in violation of chapter 893; domestic violence, and significant medical neglect or severe abuse; or a combination of issues such as financial stressors and unmet mental health needs.

**Instructions and Considerations:** The reviewer should find documentation a CLS staffing occurred when the above factors were identified during the course of the investigation and the investigator determines the case is high risk and the child is in need of the protection and supervision of the court. The staffing must be documented on a CLS form or in the case file that clearly states the date the staffing was held, the individuals who participated in the staffing, the legal action requested or contemplated, the outcome of the staffing, and any follow up action recommended. Below are some guidelines provided by Children’s Legal Services regarding legal staffings:

1. When a CPI and/or their supervisor believe the case to be high risk, the case must be staffed with CLS pursuant to 39. 301(9)(b) F.S. for a full discussion regarding the risk factors. The statute mandates the filing of a dependency petition where the Department concludes that the case is high risk. Florida Statute 39.301(9)(b) lays out potential factors that may be considered in making the high risk determination, but the statute does not preclude consideration of other factors that also affect the risk to the child. The case need not be staffed with Legal unless the CPI, in consultation with his or her supervisor, and after a thorough safety assessment, concludes that the risk is high or there otherwise exists a need for court action. Note that court action can include not only removal or dependency but also steps related to keeping a child safely in the home.

2. CLS shall staff all cases where a child protective investigator (CPI) is seeking court action.

3. Both the CPI and his/her supervisor along with CLS must ensure that a complete discussion occurs during the legal staffing. This includes (but is not limited to): all relevant facts related to the incident in question, the family’s history with the Department, criminal histories, information obtained from collateral and professional contacts, the type and effectiveness of services offered, and any other information that is relevant to the decision regarding whether or not to take court action.
4. Child protective investigators will not staff cases with CLS when they (and their supervisors) have made a decision to close the case and no child safety issues have been identified.

5. In domestic violence cases, Operating Procedure 175-21 applies. Case workers are required to confer with CLS about seeking a court order requiring the perpetrator to attend a batterer's intervention program (BIP) in addition to any other family-preservation services that may be appropriate for the family. Consistent with this OP, as stated in 1 and 2 above, cases (even domestic violence cases) should be staffed with CLS when the worker desires court action of some kind, such as ordering the perpetrator into a BIP program. However, if the CPI and his/her supervisor determine that the child is safe and no court action is needed, no legal staffing is necessary.

6. Whenever CLS is involved, it is important that the lawyer on the case articulate clearly the legal analysis using the Legal Decision Making Form, including material facts behind a conclusion. As part of our accountability beyond our Department as well as effective communication throughout our Department, the reasoning should be made clear to non-professional readers and to those within the Department who are not closely involved in these cases on a daily basis.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the case file contains evidence the investigation was staffed with CLS when there was evidence the child was in need of the protection and supervision of the court, regardless of the outcome of the staffing.

✓ Document “0” if the investigation documented the child was in need of the protection and supervision of the court, but a CLS staffing was not documented.

✓ Document “NA” if a CLS staffing was not required or needed.

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.

Requirements: If it is determined a child is in need of the protection and supervision of the court, the department is required to file a dependency petition.

Instructions and Considerations: The decision to file a dependency petition should result in subsequent court action unless the case file documented a compelling reason not to pursue a dependency action. The reviewer should determine if the investigation supported and/or the staffing results recommended filing a dependency petition.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the investigation supported and/or the CLS staffing recommended filing a dependency petition and a petition was filed; or the
case file documented the basis for not pursuing a dependency action; or the CLS staffing documented no legal sufficiency and a dependency petition was not filed and the reviewer agrees the protection and supervision of the court were not warranted.

✓ Document “0” if the CLS staffing documented legal sufficiency and a dependency petition was not filed and the case file failed to document the basis for this decision, e.g., family cooperating with services, etc.; the investigation supported the need for a dependency action, but the CLS staffing recommended no petition be filed, and the basis for this decision was not supported by the case file or the CLS staffing documentation.

✓ Document “NA” if “NA” was documented for review standard 12.1.

Note: When rating the standard “0,” the reviewer should document the presenting concerns that resulted in the risk being high, and the need of the protection and supervision of the court.

Reference: ss. 39.301(9) & (9) (b) & 39.401(1-3), F.S., Safety Outcome Item 3
Referral to the Child Protection Team (CPT)

13.0 The alleged child victim(s) was referred to the Child Protection Team (CPT) and the referral was made timely when required.

13.1 A referral was made to the Child Protection Team (CPT) when required.

Requirements: If CPT services were indicated following the initial investigation, evidence of a referral for services must be found in the case file. The reviewer should determine if the allegation or subsequent investigative activities determined any one of the following CPT referral criteria was met:

1) Injuries to the head, bruises to the neck or head, burns, fractures in a child of any age.
2) Bruises anywhere on a child 5 or younger.
3) Any report alleging sexual abuse of a child.
4) Any sexually transmitted disease in a prepubescent child.
5) Reported malnutrition of a child and failure of a child to thrive.
6) Reported medical neglect of a child.
7) Any family in which one or more children have pronounced dead on arrival at a hospital or other health care facility, or have been injured and later died, as a result of suspected abuse, abandonment or neglect, when any sibling remains in the home.
8) Symptoms of serious emotional problems in a child when emotional or other abuse, neglect, abandonment is suspected.

NOTE: If, during an investigation, circumstances indicate the need for a child to receive a medical evaluation or other CPT assessment or services in order to determine whether abuse or neglect has occurred (such as when a child expresses pain without visible injury) a referral to CPT should be made even if the injury did not meet mandatory referral criteria.

Instructions and Considerations: Determine if the allegation or circumstance met one of the criteria defined in statute. If the report met the criteria for a mandatory referral and a CPT service was not provided, an exception form should be in the case file documenting the reason why no referral was made. Assessment is based on referrals as required per law, and includes some specific exceptions. The following circumstances document when a face-to-face medical evaluation may not be required, even when the above have been alleged:

- The child was examined for the alleged abuse or neglect by a physician, who is not a member of the CPT, and a consultation between physician and CPT has occurred and the examining physician concluded a further medical evaluation was unnecessary.
- The CPI, with supervisory approval, determined, after conducting a child safety
assessment, there were no indications of injuries. (Must be documented in the file).

- The CPT pediatrician determined a medical evaluation was not required.

**Rating:**

- Document “9” if the investigation met the CPT referral criteria (or the investigation circumstances warranted a CPT referral) and a referral was made to the CPT. (Refer to standard16 if investigation involved an exception.)

- Document “0” if the investigation met the CPT referral criteria (or the investigation circumstances warranted a CPT referral) and no referral was made.

- Document “NA” if the report did not meet the CPT referral criteria.

**13.2 The referral was timely.**

**Requirements:** The reviewer should determine if the allegation or circumstance met one of the CPT referral criteria outlined in the prior question. If CPT services were indicated following the initial investigation, evidence of a referral for services should be found in the case file.

**Instructions and Considerations:** The timeliness of the referral should be considered if an injury was present. It is appropriate for the referral to be made as soon as the child/victim was contacted.

**Additional Guidance:** The reviewer must determine if the allegation or circumstance met one of the criteria enumerated in statute. If the report met the criteria for a mandatory referral and a CPT service was not provided, an exception form should be signed by the supervisor and in the file. There is no specified time frame for referring children to CPT but the reviewer is required to assess timeliness based on the presenting circumstances. In all investigations involving serious physical injury, sexual abuse, malnutrition or other maltreatments that require a medical evaluation to ensure safety or preserve evidence, the CPI should seek the immediate/same day assessment of the child by CPT. If the child sustained minor injuries, a referral within 24 hours may be warranted to ensure the injury is documented before it fades.

**Rating:**

- Document “9” if all of the child victims were referred to CPT timely.

- Document “7” or “5” if some, but not all, of the child victims were referred to CPT timely.

- Document “0” if none of the child victims were timely referred to CPT.

- Document “NA” if a CPT referral was not required.

**Reference:** s. 39.303(2-4), F.S., Safety Outcome 2, Item 4
**Child Protection Team Discussions**

14.0 **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.**

*Requirements:* The case file should contain documentation of the date, time, and relevant background information that was shared with the Child Protection Team.

*Instructions and Considerations:* The documentation may include information related to the current situation; a brief family history; subject and collateral statements; prior history in Florida, as well as other states in which the family is known to have resided; any known criminal information; and the involvement of other professionals in the care and treatment of the child and/or family. As new information develops throughout the investigation that warrants continued CPT involvement, the Child Protection Investigator must continue to update CPT.

*Rating:*

- ✓ Document “9” if the record indicates compliance with all of the requirements.
- ✓ Document “7” or “5” if the CPI complied with some but not all of the requirements.
- ✓ Document “0” if the CPI did not comply with any of the requirements.
- ✓ Document “NA” if no CPT referral was required.

Child Protection Team Recommendations

15.0 CPT assessment findings and recommendations related to child safety were followed or the rationale for not following the assessment and recommendations was documented.

Requirements: Any written documentation received from CPT should be included in the case file. Consideration of CPT assessment information should be evident in child safety decisions. If assessment findings or recommendations related to child safety were not followed, the reason for this should be documented in the case file. Note: This applies to CPT only. Information received from other professions is addressed in Standard 11.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the CPI followed CPT assessment findings and recommendations or documented a justification for not following these in the case file.

✓ Document “7” or “5” if the CPI considered some assessment findings, and/or followed some recommendations, but did not provide a rationale for not following all assessment findings or recommendations.

✓ Document “0” if none of the assessment findings or recommendations were followed and there was no justification for not following the assessment findings, and/or recommendations found in the case file.

✓ Document “NA” if a CPT referral was not required.

Supervisory Review of Exceptions

16.0 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.

Requirements: This exception applies only to children whose circumstances require a medical evaluation. These are the only conditions in which a face-to-face medical evaluation can be waived by the Department. A face-to-face medical evaluation by CPT is not necessary when:

(a) The child was examined for the alleged abuse or neglect by a physician who is not a member of the CPT and a consultation between the CPT board-certified pediatrician, advanced registered nurse practitioner, physician assistant working under the supervision of a CPT board-certified pediatrician or registered nurse working under the direct supervision of a CPT board-certified pediatrician, and the examining physician concluded a further medical evaluation was unnecessary;

(b) The CPI, with supervisory approval, determined after conducting a child safety assessment, there were no indications of injuries as described in review element standard 13; or

(c) The CPT board-certified pediatrician determined a medical evaluation was not necessary. Notwithstanding (a), (b), and (c), a CPT pediatrician may determine a face-to-face medical evaluation is necessary.

Additional Guidance: The reviewer should look for a copy of the CPT Exception ("Waiver") form signed by the supervisor or documentation in the case file by the CPI supervisor approving the exception.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the report met requirements for a mandated referral, the CPI determined there were no indications of injury, an exception to the medical evaluation was completed and the supervisor approved the exception documented in the case file.

✓ Document “9” if the supervisor appropriately concurred with CPTs decision to treat a mandatory referral as a consult based on the evidence gathered during the investigation.

✓ Document “0” if the report met requirements for a mandated referral, a referral was not made and there was no exception to the mandatory referral signed by the supervisor found in the case file.

✓ Document “0” if there was no evidence the supervisor concurred with CPT’s decision to treat a mandatory referral as a consult based on the evidence gathered during the investigation.

✓ Document “NA” if the presenting concerns did not meet the mandatory referral criteria or the exception did not apply.

Reference: ss. 39.303(2) (a-h), & 39.303 (4) (b), F.S.
Incident Date

17.0 BLANK – Standard Deleted in 2010

Maltreatment Findings

18.0 All maltreatment findings were supported by the information gathered and appropriately documented in the investigative record.

Requirements: The following guidelines should be followed.

- Verified findings – a preponderance of the credible evidence results in a determination the specific harm or threat of harm was the result of abuse, neglect or abandonment.

- Not substantiated findings – credible evidence, which does not meet the standard of “preponderance” to support the specific harm was the result of abuse, neglect or abandonment.

- No Indicator findings – there is no credible evidence to support the allegations of abuse, abandonment, or neglect.

“Preponderance” means the greater weight of the evidence, or more likely than not to have occurred.

Instructions and Considerations: Consider whether information obtained from the investigation activities supported the findings entered for the alleged maltreatment(s). The reviewer may consult the approved CFOP 175-28 Child Maltreatment Index (formerly known as the Allegation Matrix) for additional guidelines and factors to consider in determining whether information gathered during the investigation supported the maltreatment findings.

Additional Guidance: The reviewer should note in the comment section if maltreatments were identified during the course of the investigation, but not added to the report. The omission may require a new report be called to the Florida Abuse Hotline by the QA Reviewer.

Rating:

- Document “9” if the case file contained sufficient support for all maltreatment findings initially identified, as well as subsequently identified during the course of the investigation.

- Document “7” or “5” if the case file provided sufficient support for some but not all of the maltreatment findings or an additional maltreatment(s) should have been but was not.

- Document “0” if the case file failed to document sufficient support for all of the maltreatment findings identified during the course of the investigation.

Reference: ss. 39.301(10) (b), F.S.; CFOP 175-28
Early Services Intervention Staffing

19.0 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.

Requirements: ESI staffings may prevent unnecessary placements by initiating family preservation services in the child’s own home.

The intent of an ESI staffing is to gather all interested parties to participate in a collaborative effort to make the most informed and beneficial decisions concerning services for the family, case planning, and possibly moving a child into out-of-home care.

The ESI process should start a multi-disciplinary team pre-placement process when placement is necessary, which should increase the chance of placement stability.

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer is not limited to responding favorably only if an ESI staffing occurred. Rather the reviewer should determine if any staffing or other assessment processes between two or more parties occurred to determine if there were services that would allow the child to remain in the home.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if placement was a possibility and an ESI staffing occurred, regardless of the outcome of the staffing.

✓ Document “0” if placement was a possibility and no ESI staffing occurred.

✓ Document “N/A” if there was no possibility of placement during the investigation.

✓ Document “N/A” if it was completely unreasonable to “staff” the situation prior to taking emergency steps to protect the child, i.e., middle of the night, egregious abuse/neglect.

Reference: Section 65C-30.002, F.A.C.
Identification of Service Needs

20.0 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.

a) Child. *(Not restricted to focus child or child identified as the victim in the abuse hotline report.)*

b) Mother

c) Father

d) Other Caregiver or Caretaker Responsible. *(if other than the mother or father and has access or ongoing contact with the child)*

**Requirement:** One of the requirements for conducting an investigation is to determine the immediate protective, treatment, and ameliorative services necessary to reduce or eliminate the immediate identified risks or the need for ongoing supervision. The CPI is required to identify the immediate service needs of the children and families served. Administrative Code states if the Department or Sheriff’s Office CPI determines a child requires immediate or long term protection, such services shall first be offered for non-judicial acceptance unless there are high risk factors that may impact the ability of the parents or legal custodians to exercise judgment. It further states if the Department or Sheriff’s Office or contracted service provider determines the need to engage ongoing services, an Early Services Intervention staffing shall be requested by the CPI or the CPI Supervisor. During the staffing, the CPI is to provide any recommendations for expedited services. Examples of immediate service needs may include removal, at risk childcare, food, housing, clothing, referral to domestic violence shelter, assistance with a domestic violence injunction, emergency hospitalizations to address substance abuse or mental health concerns, or other community services.

**Instructions and Considerations:** Immediate service needs require the CPI to complete the service referrals rather than delay until the family is staffed for ongoing supervision services or because there is no plan to refer for ongoing supervision services. Immediate services should mitigate or eliminate immediate safety concerns. The reviewer must determine if the CPI appropriately identified the immediate service needs of the family and/or the need for ongoing supervision services to stabilize the family and mitigate the risks.

**Rating:**

- ✔ Document “9” if the CPI identified the immediate service needs of the family and/or the ongoing supervision service needs to stabilize the family and mitigate the risks.

- ✔ Document “7” or “5” if the CPI identified some but not all of the immediate service needs and/or ongoing needed supervision services to stabilize the family and mitigate the risks.

- ✔ Document “0” if the CPI did not identify any of the immediate service needs and/or ongoing supervision needs, but should have based on the facts of the case.
✓ Document “NA” if the investigation did not support the need for immediate services or ongoing supervision services.

✓ If the family was already receiving services and the reviewer concurs with continuation of all or some of those services, document “9,” “7,” or “5,” as appropriate. Do not document “NA” because the family was already receiving services or was under supervision.

Reference: ss. 39.301(10) (b) 6, F.S.; 65C-29.00(3) (k-l) & 65C-30.002 (1) (d) (12), F.A.C., Safety Outcome 2, Item 4
Referral for Services

21.0  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).

a) Child. (Not restricted to the focus child or child identified as the victim in the abuse hotline report.)
b) Mother
c) Father
d) Other Caregiver or Caretaker Responsible. (if someone other than the mother or father and has access or ongoing contact with the child)

Requirements: The CPI is required to identify and make arrangements for the immediate service and/or ongoing supervision needs of the children and families served. The immediate service needs may include at risk childcare, food, housing, clothing, referral to a domestic violence shelter, assistance with a domestic violence injunction, emergency hospitalizations to address substance abuse or mental health concerns, or other community services.

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer should assess compliance with this review element for the entire family, not just the victim/child identified by the Hotline. The reviewer must determine if the CPI identified either immediate services or ongoing supervision needs or should have identified immediate services or ongoing supervision needs, and whether a referral for these services was completed. If in-home non-judicial services were offered and the family declined the service, the record should support the protection and supervision of the court was not warranted based on the existing concerns.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the CPI documented referrals for all immediate services and/or ongoing supervision needs.

✓ Document “7” or “5” if the CPI documented referrals for some of the immediate services and/or ongoing supervision needs.

✓ Document “0” if the CPI did not document referrals for any of the immediate services or ongoing supervision needs.

✓ Document “NA” if the investigation determined no need for immediate services or ongoing supervision, or the family was currently receiving ongoing services and no additional service needs were identified.

Reference: ss. 39.301(9) (a-b) & 39.301(915), F.S.; & 65C-29.003(3) (k-m), F.A.C., Safety Outcome 2, Item 3
Engaging Services

22.0 If documentation reflects the need for immediate services and/or ongoing supervision, the investigation record contained evidence the services were engaged.

Requirements: The CPI is responsible for following up on referrals to the services deemed necessary to ensure immediate safety and mitigate risk, when the services are assessed to be critical to the protection of the child(ren).

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer should assess compliance based on the identification and engagement of all identified immediate services and ongoing supervision needs of all family members, and not just the identified child victims or focus child under review. The reviewer is required to consider child safety and the level of family functioning when assessing the CPI’s performance in ensuring the engagement of services. If in-home non-judicial services were deemed necessary as a result of a CLS staffing, the case file should confirm the family agreed when contacted by the case manager responsible for ongoing supervision services. (Note: If in-home non-judicial services are recommended and the family declines the services, and the case is considered moderate to near high risk, a multi-disciplinary staffing shall be held to decide next steps.)

The reviewer should consider engagement if court ordered supervision is in place. Documentation of engagement may be confirmed through documentation in the case file. If a referral is made for a community service such as in-home prevention services and the service is deemed critical to reducing risk, the reviewer should look for evidence the family followed through on the referral or the provider made contact with the family. The reviewer may assume engagement occurred if the provider and family made contact and/or a waiting list exists.

The reviewer should also consider documentation in the case file that indicates a clear understanding of who has “ownership” of the case after the transition from investigation to service provision.

Rating:

✔ Document “9” if community, family preservation, removal or CBC services were required to reduce the identified risk to the children and the case file documented the needed services were engaged.

✔ Document “7” or “5” if the case file documented engagement with some but not all needed services or supervision to reduce risk to the children.

✔ Document “0” if the case file did not document engagement with any of the needed services or supervision identified as critical to reducing risk.

✔ Document “NA” if the investigation documented no needs for immediate or ongoing supervision, if the family declined services, or the family was currently receiving ongoing services and no additional service needs were identified.

Reference: ss. 39.301(8) (a); & 39.301(14) (a), F.S., Safety Outcome 2, Item 3
Communication between the Child Protective Investigator and Case Manager

23.0 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.

**Requirements:** The CPI is required to notify the assigned Case Manager within one workday when there was an active service case at the time a report was received for investigation. However, there should be more than notification; there should be evidence of meaningful communication between the CPI and the Case Manager or Case Management Supervisor as the CPI needs to know what is happening in the services case and the case manager needs to be aware of the investigative events, subsequent findings, and dispositional decisions.

**Rating:**

- ✓ Document “9” if communication with case management occurred within one workday of receiving the report and there is documentation the CPI and case management collaborated in making appropriate safety decisions on behalf of the child.

- ✓ Document “7” if the CPI made continuous attempts to communicate with the case manager or supervisor within a reasonable amount of time, and upon contact collaborated with case management in making appropriate investigation decisions on behalf of the child.

- ✓ Document “5” if CPI made some attempts throughout the investigation to collaborate with case management, but did not assertively pursue contact and collaboration.

- ✓ Document “0” if there is no documentation to support attempts to contact case management and thus no collaborative communication occurred.

- ✓ Document “NA” if the child was not active to case management supervision services during the time the report was under investigation.

**Reference:** 65C-30.015(1), F.A.C.
Thoroughness of the Investigation

24.0 The investigation was thorough and appropriate steps were taken to ensure child safety.

Requirements: For each report received, the CPI is required to determine the protective, treatment, and ameliorative services necessary to safeguard and ensure the child’s safety, well-being and development, and initiate the delivery of those services through the early intervention of the department.

Instructions and Considerations: The CPI must use information obtained throughout the investigation to determine the implications to safety, and include criminal history, priors, and strengths and concerns to arrive at an appropriate recommended disposition. A sound decision should be derived through collaborative efforts among the CPI, services Case Manager and CLS (DCF, Office of the Attorney General or Office of the State Attorney) involved.

The reviewer must evaluate how well the CPI used all of the information gathered to appropriately assess child safety, immediate and long-term risk, and whether the CPI’s actions contributed positively to an appropriate investigative closure decision.

Additional Guidance: The reviewer should consider whether the child was living in a safe environment, whether a safety plan was needed and developed, whether the plan was adequate to ensure the child’s continued safety, and whether the family was engaged with the services needed to reduce risk to the children prior to closing the investigation.

Note: This standard is weighted depending on the responses to standards #1, 4, 5, 7, 10 and 22. If any of these standards received a rating of “5” or “0”, standard # 24 cannot be assigned a rating above “5”.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the case file contained evidence all necessary investigative activities were completed, to include collaborative contacts in making appropriate safety decisions and investigative dispositions.

✓ Document “7” if most of the necessary investigative activities were completed, to include collaborative contacts in making appropriate safety decisions and disposition and child safety was not compromised.

✓ Document “5” if some investigative activities were completed, to include collaborative contacts in making appropriate safety decisions and disposition but some of the omissions may have compromised child safety.

✓ Document “0” if the case file did not contain documentation of the necessary investigative activities, including the lack of appropriate communication and collaboration between and among the parties, and compromised child safety.

Note: The Reviewer must carefully consider any ratings of “5” or “0” to this standard to determine if a Request for Action is needed to ensure child safety.

Reference: ss. 39.301, F.S., 65C-29.003, F.A.C., Safety Outcome 1, Item 1 and 2
American Indian or Native Alaskan

25.0 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.

Requirements: The CPI is required to document an inquiry was made in every investigation as to whether or not the child is of American Indian or Alaskan Native descent. No assumptions should be made about ancestry based on the child’s or family members’ physical appearance or surnames.

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer must determine if the inquiry was appropriately documented in the case file.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the inquiry was appropriately documented in the case file.

✓ Document “0” if the inquiry was not documented in the case file.

Supervisory Guidance and Direction

26.0 Appropriate supervisory guidance and direction were provided and ensured a thorough investigation was completed.

   a) Initial supervisory guidance
   b) On-going supervisory guidance

Requirements: The CPI Supervisor is required to review all investigations and provide appropriate guidance and direction.

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer should consider the information known or needed at the time the supervisor reviewed the case file and whether the guidance and direction were appropriate given what was known and needed before the conclusion of the investigation.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the case file contained appropriate supervisory guidance and direction.

✓ Document “7” or “5” if the case file documented some but not all of the needed supervisory guidance and direction were provided. Consideration should be given to guidance relative to child safety and disposition.

✓ Document “0” if the case file failed to document needed supervisory guidance and direction.

✓ Document “NA” if the supervisor's signature affirmed the CPI’s actions to date were appropriate and the case file documentation supported no further supervisory guidance and direction were needed.

Reference: s. 39.301(4), F.S.; & 65C-29.003(6) (b), F.A.C., CFSR Systemic Factor #31
**Supervisory Follow-up**

**27.0 Follow through occurred on the supervisory guidance and direction provided, or there was documentation it was no longer necessary.**

a) The CPI followed through on the supervisory guidance and direction.

b) 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.

c) The CPI supervisor ensured the CPI followed through on the 2\(^{nd}\) party reviewer guidance and direction, or documented justification actions were no longer necessary.

**Requirements:** The CPI Supervisor is required to review investigations and provide guidance to the CPI throughout the investigation. The CPI should complete the follow-up activities that were recommended by the CPI Supervisor as quickly and thoroughly as possible.

**Instructions and Considerations:** The reviewer must identify all of the guidance and direction provided by the CPI Supervisor and the information documenting the CPI’s follow-through on the guidance and direction provided. Consider all information documented in the case file to assess compliance with this review element.

**Additional Guidance:** The reviewer should not consider follow-up on guidance initially provided by the CPI Supervisor if the CPI Supervisor documented the initial guidance and direction were no longer needed, and the reviewer agrees the guidance and direction were no longer needed.

**Rating:**

- ✓ Document “9” if the CPI followed up on all of the supervisory guidance and direction provided.

- ✓ Document “7” or “5” if the CPI followed up on some but not all of the supervisory guidance and direction provided. Consideration should be given to guidance relative to child safety and disposition.

- ✓ Document “0” if the CPI followed up on none of the supervisory guidance and direction provided.

- ✓ Document “NA” if the supervisor documented no specific guidance and direction because none was needed.

**Reference:** 65C-29.003(6) (b) 1, F.A.C., CFSR Systemic Factor #31
Investigation Closure Notification  (New for 2010)

28.0 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.

Requirements: If the investigation determines the child and family need on-going services or supervision administered by the community based care (CBC) lead agency, the CPI or CPI supervisor must ensure the receiving agency is notified the investigation is being closed and no further intervention or oversight will be provided by the CPI. A well-communicated and documented notification should help ensure the child remains safe either in the home or in placement (if the child was removed) and clearly identify who is responsible from that point forward.

Instructions and Considerations: Even if the case was previously staffed and the receiving agency agreed to begin service provision while the investigation continued, actually closing the investigation is a critical juncture and all parties must be aware of the implications therein. Department and CBC staff must understand who is responsible for any intervention activity at all times, and especially when the investigation is being closed. The reviewer should look for documentation of a telephone contact, an email, or other form(s) of documentation that reflects the CPI or CPI supervisor clearly alerted the receiving lead agency about investigative closure and that any ongoing interventions would be the receiving agency’s responsibility.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the case file clearly documents that the CPI or CPI supervisor alerted the receiving agency that the investigation was being closed and no further intervention/oversight would be provided by the CPI.

✓ Document “7” if there is some indication the CPI or CPI supervisor made the receiving agency aware of the closure, but it was beyond the closure date and/or there was limited communication.

✓ Document “5” if there is some indication the CPI or CPI supervisor made the receiving agency aware of the closure, but it was well after closure and/or there were significant deficiencies or discrepancies in the information exchanged.

✓ Document “0” if there was no indication that the CPI or CPI supervisor completed this activity during the closure and hand-off period.

✓ Document “NA” for investigations that were closed with no request for services or supervision by the CBC.

Reference: Effective practices as defined and mandated by the Assistant Secretary for Operations.
Services Prior to Removal

29.0 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.

Requirements: A child should not be removed from his/her home if, with the provisions of intervention and preventive services, the child could safely remain in the home.

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer should not assume the requirement is achieved based solely on finding “reasonable efforts” language in court orders. The reviewer must assess the investigative response based on evidence regarding the reasons for removal found in the case file. The reviewer should determine if the CPI made concerted and reasonable efforts to provide appropriate services to the family to prevent removal.

Concerted efforts refer to conducting a safety assessment to identify the services necessary to ensure child safety in the home, facilitating the family’s access to the services, and ensuring the family’s engagement with needed services. Appropriate services are those provided to, or arranged for the family with the explicit goal of ensuring the child’s immediate safety and meeting the specific needs or circumstances of the family. For example, if in-home intervention services were immediately available to ensure safety, removal may not be necessary. In another example, if the parent alleged to be the caretaker responsible is willing to leave the home and the non-custodial parent can ensure his/her continued absence, is willing to engage in appropriate services and can ensure the child’s immediate and ongoing safety, removal may not be necessary.

Rating:

✔ Document “9” when the case file contained evidence the CPI made concerted efforts to provide services that would allow the child to remain safely in his/her home.

✔ Document “0” when the case file did not document support for the CPI’s decision to remove the child based on the evidence and the circumstances that existed at the time of the child’s removal.

✔ Document NA if the parent was hospitalized, arrested or was a perpetrator of egregious abuse and/or no services could protect the child while in the home.

Reference: Task Force on Child Protection (October 2007 Recommendations) ss. 39.401(l)(b)1-3; & 39.401(3); & 39.402(l)(a-c)&(2) & (7), F.S., Safety Outcome 2, Item 3
Indian Child Welfare Act

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.

30.1 The investigation file contained a completed ICWA Eligibility form.

Requirements: The CPI is required to complete the ICWA Eligibility Form (CF-FSP 5323 or similar documentation) in all judicial interventions by documenting the family’s response to the inquiry and the family information needed to assist the tribe in determining the child and family’s eligibility for enrollment. The form must be signed by at least one parent to be considered complete.

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer must determine if the inquiry was appropriately documented on ICWA Eligibility Form (CF-FSP 5323 or similar documentation) and was signed by at least one parent.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the inquiry was appropriately documented on ICWA Eligibility Form (CF-FSP or similar documentation) and was signed by at least one parent.

✓ Document “0” if the inquiry was not documented on ICWA Eligibility Form (CF-FSP or similar documentation) or was incomplete (to include not being signed by at least one parent).

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.

Requirements: The CPI is required to complete the activities outlined on the ICWA Checklist to identify the children’s Indian ancestry, complete a diligent search, and notify the tribe. The ICWA Checklist is required when a child was removed or court ordered supervision was pursued.

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer must find a completed ICWA Checklist when a removal has occurred or court ordered supervision services were pursued and the family claims the child(ren) is of American Indian or Alaskan Native descent.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the ICWA Checklist was required and thoroughly completed.

✓ Document “7” or “5” if the ICWA Checklist was required and partially completed.

✓ Document “0” if the ICWA Checklist was required and not completed.

✓ Document NA if the family reported they are not of American Indian or Native Alaskan descent.
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.

Requirements: The CPI is required to timely initiate the search process by contacting the designated tribe or Bureau of Indian Affairs if American Indian or Native Alaskan descent is claimed and the CPI plans to remove the children or pursue court ordered supervision services.

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer is required to look for evidence in the case file that the CPI initiated the search process by calling the designated tribe or Bureau of Indian Affairs when the CPI removed child[ren] or planned to pursue court ordered supervision services.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the CPI timely initiated the search process by calling the designated tribe or Bureau of Indian Affairs.

✓ Document “0” if a search process was required and not initiated.

✓ Document “NA” if no search process was required (The family reported they were not of American Indian or Native Alaskan descent).

30.4 The court was informed when a child was determined to be a member of a tribe or eligible to be a member.

Requirements: The CPI is responsible for notifying the court when a child is removed or court ordered supervision services were being pursued and the child (ren) was determined to be a member of a tribe or tribal eligibility was being pursued.

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer should look for evidence the court was notified when children were removed or court ordered supervision services were pursued and the child (ren) was determined to be a member of a tribe or eligibility for tribal membership was pursued. Evidence may be found in court documents or in a chronological note entry.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the case file documented the CPI advised the court.

✓ Document “0” if notification was required and there was no evidence of court notification in the case file.

✓ Document NA if the family reported they are not or American Indian or Native Alaskan descent.

Reference: 65C-28.013(1)-(7), F.A.C.; 65C-30.001(67-69) & (146); 65C-30.002(1) (a) & (1) (e) 4, F.A.C.
Placement Priority

31.0 Once the decision was made to remove the child, placement priority was given to responsible relatives/non-relatives rather than licensed care.

Requirements: If a decision is made to remove the child(ren), the CPI is required to explore alternatives to placement rather than licensed care, and give placement priority to a parent or other responsible adult relative/non-relative if it is in the child(ren)’s best interest.

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer must assess compliance with this review element by looking for evidence in the case file of the CPI’s efforts to identify, contact and interview maternal and paternal relatives, non-custodial parents or non-relatives before placing the child in a licensed care. If potential placement with responsible relatives/non-relatives was not immediately available, the reviewer should consider attempts to identify potential caretakers for the entire period of time the CPI was responsible for identifying placement options.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the case file contained evidence of the CPI’s inquiries and attempts to explore other responsible adult relative and non-relative caregivers on both the mother’s and father’s side of the family during the removal process and investigation.

✓ Document “7” or “5” if the case file documents some but not all responsible relative and non-relative caregivers were explored during the removal process and investigation.

✓ Document “0” if the case file documented no efforts to explore other responsible relative and non-relative caregivers.

✓ Document NA if removal was completed by the CPI on an open case management services case and the placement decision with a relative/non-relative was made by the CBC case manager.

Reference: ss. 39.401(2), F.S., Permanency Outcome 2, Item 15
Background Checks and Home Inspections

32.0 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.

Note: If removal was completed by the CPI on an open case management services case and the decision to place with a relative or non-relative was made by the CBC case manager, the reviewer will document N/A to the question and subparts 1-4. The CPI should ensure copies of the home study and information related to the background checks completed by the CBC case manager, are included in the case file.

32.1 The required background checks were completed during the home study process prior to the child's placement.

1. Prior abuse reports
2. Department of Juvenile Justice (ages 12-26)
3. Local Law Enforcement
4. Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE)
5. NCIC
6. Department of Corrections
7. Child Welfare Out of State (if the record reflects the family resided in another state)
8. Prior case management records
9. Other (for example, military records or 911 service calls, as needed)

Requirements: If placement in a non-licensed setting is being arranged by the CPI, the CPI must complete criminal and abuse history checks on all household members and frequent visitors. This includes fully assessing the information the checks provide while making placement decisions.

Instructions and Considerations: To assess compliance with this review element, the reviewer should find the required NCIC check when a placement is made with a relative/non-relative placement or testimony, or evidence exists that a household member(s) has an arrest history in Florida or in another state. (The reviewer should exclude the NCIC requirement when placement is made with a biological/legal parent.)

The CPI should not recommend the placement if the results of the criminal, delinquency, and/or abuse and neglect history indicate the child's safety may be jeopardized in the placement. The home is disqualified if the criminal records check reveals a felony conviction, including a plea of nolo contendere or guilty (regardless of adjudication) at any time for the following:

- child abuse or neglect or abandonment
- spousal abuse or domestic violence
- impregnation of a child under the age of 16 by a person over the age of 21
- selling or buying minors
- child pornography; sexual performance by a child; lewd or lascivious offenses committed upon or in the presence of a person less than 16 years of age; computer pornography
The home is also disqualified if the criminal records check reveals a felony conviction, including a plea of nolo contendere or guilty (regardless of adjudication) within the past five years for the following:

- Aggravated assault; aggravated battery
- Prohibited acts (drug abuse)
- Unlawful possession of listed chemicals

**Rating:**

- **Document “9”** when the case file contained evidence all required background checks were completed prior to the child’s placement.
- **Document “7” or “5”** when the case file contained evidence some but not all of the required background checks were completed prior to the child’s placement or all of the required background checks were completed after the child was placed.
- **Document “0”** when the case file contains no evidence the required background checks were completed either before or following the child’s placement.
- **Document “NA”** when a background check was not required

### 32.2 A physical inspection of the home was completed during the home study process prior to the child’s placement.

**Requirements:** If a placement in a non-licensed setting is being arranged by the CPI, the CPI must complete and document a physical inspection of the home prior to the child’s placement.

**Instructions and Considerations:** The reviewer is required to assess compliance with this review element through finding evidence the physical inspection of the home was completed prior to the child’s placement. The physical inspection of the home is typically documented on the unified home study.

**Rating:**

- **Document “9”** if the CPI documented a physical inspection of the home prior to the placement of the child.
- **Document “7” or “5”** if the CPI completed a physical inspection of the home following the child’s placement in the home or documentation of the physical inspection of the home was minimal.
Document “0” if the case file contained no documentation a physical inspection of the home was completed.

Document “NA” if no removal or no placement in an unlicensed placement occurred.

Reference: ss. 39.521(2) (r) 3 & 39.401(3), F.S., 65C-30.009(2) (c) 1, F.A.C.;

32.3 An evaluation of the prospective caregiver’s capacity to protect was completed during the home study process prior to the child’s placement.

Requirements: The CPI is required to document an evaluation of the prospective caregiver’s capacity to protect prior to the child’s placement. The Unified Home Study requires the CPI to document the caregiver’s: understanding of the child’s need for care and permanency; willingness to provide long-term permanency if needed; understanding of his or her rights and responsibilities in the dependency process; capacity to provide adequate and nurturing care and ensure an adequate and safe home; ability to financially care for the child; and understanding of the financial assistance and other services available from the community. Additionally, the CPI is required to document the basis for the decision to recommend or not recommend the placement.

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer is required to determine compliance with this review element based on the CPI’s documented assessment of the prospective caregivers’ suitability. An evaluation of the prospective caregivers’ capacity to protect should at a minimum address: the caregivers’ relationship with the parents; medical, developmental, mental health and substance abuse issues; the presence or absence of threat to the child (ren)’s safety, and when a potential threat exists, discussion of an appropriate plan for responding to the threat.

Rating:

Document “9” if there was evidence of the CPI’s informed judgment of the prospective caregivers’ suitability, and the presence or absence of a threat to the children’s safety was addressed.

Document “0” if there was no evidence of the CPI’s informed judgment of the prospective caregivers’ suitability.

Document “0” if there was no evidence of the CPI’s informed judgment of the presence or absence of a threat to the children’s safety or the issue was addressed with a check in the box on the caregiver’s home study.

Document “NA” if no removal or placement with a relative or non-relative caregiver occurred.

Reference: s. 39.521(2) (r) 1-7, F.S.; 65C-30.009 (2), F.A.C.
32.4 The completed home study was documented in FSFN.

Requirements: The study of the home must be documented on the Unified Home Study in FSFN.

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer may need to conduct an actual search in FSFN to determine if the UHS was appropriately completed and documented.

The reviewer may find documentation in FSFN either in template format or as a scanned document.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the unified home study was entered in FSFN.

✓ Document “0” if the unified home study was not entered in FSFN.
Placement of Sibling Groups

33.0 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.

Requirements: Every effort should be made to place siblings in the same home, and/or to help them keep in contact with one another if separated. If children cannot be placed together, a plan must be developed for frequent visitation.

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer must consider if siblings are separated due to limited resources or placement disruptions versus separations based on efforts to meet the individual child’s needs. The reviewer is required to determine compliance based on whether the siblings lived together prior to removal or whether the siblings should be placed together, e.g., newborn delivered following the removal of siblings.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the CPI placed siblings together when their prior relationship and living arrangement supported this.

✓ Document “9” if the siblings were not separated, support for the sibling bond was appropriately noted, or separation of the siblings was necessary to address the individual needs of the children (safety, therapeutic, relative or non-relative bond).

✓ Document “0” if siblings were separated and the case file did not document the separation was necessary to address the individual needs of the children (safety, therapeutic, relative or non-relative caregiver bond).

✓ Document “NA” when there were no siblings placed.

Reference: s. 39.001(1) (k), F.S.; CFSR Permanency Outcome 2, Item 12 – The Continuity of Family Relationships and Connections are Preserved for Children; & CFOP 175-34 (4) (k), Permanency Outcome 2, Item 12
Child Health Check-Up

34.0 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.

34.1 The Child Health Check-Up was completed within 72 hours of the child’s removal and a copy is in the case file.

Requirements: Florida law requires every child removed and maintained in out-of-home placement to have a Child Health Check-Up within 72 hours [formerly known as the Early Periodic Screening and Diagnostic Testing (EPSDT)], by a recognized healthcare provider to determine the child’s current condition and healthcare needs. The Child Health Check-Up is required for every child placed in a licensed home or with a relative/non-relative caregiver. Administrative Rule states, “An initial health assessment shall be completed within 72 hours of removal, unless the child is returned to the home from which he/she was removed within 72 hours of removal. Following the Early Services Intervention (case transfer) staffing, the services worker shall provide or arrange for medical care or health check-up for a child who enters out-of-home care, unless already completed by the CPI per local agreements.”

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer is required to assess compliance with this review element based on finding a completed Child Health Check-Up within 72 hours of removal by a recognized healthcare provider or the medical discharge summary for a newborn or a medical discharge summary for a child discharged from a medical inpatient unit.

Rating:

✔ Document “9” if the case file contained a copy of the completed Child Health Check-Up or medical discharge summary for a newborn or a child discharged from a medical inpatient unit, if completed within 72 hours of removal.

✔ Document “0” if the case file did not contain a copy of the completed Child Health Check-Up or the medical discharge summary for a newborn or a child discharged from a medical inpatient unit.

✔ Document NA if the child was returned to the parent/caregiver within 72 hours of removal.
34.2 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.

**Requirements:** Florida law requires every child removed to have a Child Health Check-Up.

*Instructions and Considerations:* The reviewer is required to assess compliance with this review element by ensuring a Child Health Check-Up is completed for each child removed and placed in out-of-home care. The timeframe should not be considered when evaluating compliance with this review element.

**Rating:**

- ✔ Document “9” if the Child Health Check-Up was completed, even if it was not completed timely.

- ✔ Document “0” if the case file did not contain a copy of the completed Child Health Check-Up or a copy of the medical discharge summary if the investigation involved a newborn or a child discharged from a medical in-patient unit.

- ✔ Document NA if standard 34.1 was rated as “9”.

*Reference:* s. 39.407, F.S. & 65C-29.008 (1) & 65C-30.001(17) & 65C-30.002(1) (g) 1 & 4, F.A.C, Well Being Outcome 3, Item 22
Emergency Intake Form

35.0 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.

Requirements: Florida Administrative Code requires the CPI to complete an Emergency Intake Form for each child taken into custody to identify any current medical information and/or needs of the child known by the parent, guardian or legal custodian.

Instructions and Considerations: The reviewer must assess compliance with this review element based on finding a completed Emergency Intake Form in the case file. If the form documented the parent, guardian or legal custodian initially refused to provide the information, the case file should document the CPI’s request for the court to order the parent, guardian or legal custodian to provide the required information and a completed Emergency Intake Form.

Prescribed medications must continue as ordered by the physician when the child enters an out-of-home placement, and it is the CPI’s responsibility to ensure this is a seamless transaction. If a child is on psychotropic medications when removed, the investigator must take precautions that the child’s medical and medication needs are thoroughly assessed and documented.

Rating:

✓ Document “9” if the Emergency Intake Form was thoroughly completed to include all information related to prescribed medicines, including but not limited to details about any psychotropic medications.

✓ Document “7” or “5” if the Emergency Intake form was partially completed using professional judgment.

✓ Document “0” if a completed Emergency Intake Form was not found in the case file.

✓ Document “NA” if the parent, guardian or legal custodian refused to provide the information and the court refused to order the parent, guardian or legal custodian to provide the information.

Psychotropic Medication – Informed Consent or Court Ordered

36.0 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.

Requirements: When a child taken into custody is already prescribed psychotropic medication, the CPI must take action to assure the child continues to be administered the medication under appropriate circumstances. These actions include:

- assessing the status of the medication (labeling, original container, current);
- obtaining confirmation from a physician or pharmacist as necessary;
- seeking written authorization from the parent or legal guardian; and taking follow-up action with a physician to determine the need to continue the medication and, if necessary, obtain express and informed consent or a court order; and,
- taking necessary steps to facilitate the inclusion of the parent in any consultation with the prescribing physician.

If parental rights are not terminated, parents (birth or adoptive) and/or a legal guardians are authorized to provide informed consent for the child to receive psychotropic medication(s). If a child does not have a birth or adoptive parent, or a legal guardian, authorization to treat with psychotropic medications must be pursued through a court order.

Instructions and Considerations: For children whose parents’ rights are not terminated, the prescribing physician must attempt to obtain written express and informed consent from the child’s parent or legal guardian. In a removal incident the CPI is required to take necessary steps to facilitate the inclusion of the parent in the child’s consultation with the prescribing physician. Express and informed consent from the parents must be sought by the prescribing physician prior to the administration of psychotropic medication.

The reviewers should find documentation the CPI attempted to contact the parent as soon as possible upon learning of the prescribing physician’s recommendation for psychotropic medication(s). In the pursuit of obtaining Informed Consent, the CPI is expected to facilitate communication between the parent and the prescribing physician. When express and informed consent cannot be obtained from the child’s parents, the CPI must refer the situation to the CLS attorney who will then petition the court.

Express and informed consent means consent voluntarily given in writing, by a competent person, after sufficient explanation and disclosure of the subject matter involved to enable the person to make a knowing and willful decision without any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, or other form of constraint or coercion. Sufficient explanation and disclosure includes:

- The reason for admission or treatment,
- The proposed treatment,
- The purpose of the treatment to be provided,
- The common risks, benefits and side effects,
- The specific dosage range for the medication,
• Alternative treatment modalities,
  • The approximate length of care,
  • The potential effects of stopping treatment,
  • How treatment will be monitored, and
  • Any consent for treatment may be revoked orally or in writing before or during the
    treatment period by the parent or legal guardian.

**Rating:**

✔ Document “9” if there was clear documentation a prescribing physician
  recommended the child be administered psychotropic medication(s), and the CPI
  facilitated communication between the parents and the physician to obtain their
  express and informed consent.

✔ Document “9” if express and informed consent by the parents or legal guardian was
  not obtained or their whereabouts were unknown, but the CPI immediately referred
  the matter to CLS to obtain a court order.

✔ Document “0” if there was no evidence the CPI attempted to obtain express and
  informed consent or worked with CLS to obtain a court order.

✔ Document “NA” if there were no recommendations to place the child on
  psychotropic medications or the recommendations were made after transfer to case
  management and case management was responsible for following through.

Weekly Visits

37.0  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.

**Requirements:** Children in shelter care status must be seen through a face-to-face contact at least once every seven days as long as the child remains in shelter status in a licensed home or facility. Face to face contact with the child and caregiver is to occur at least once every seven days during the first thirty days after removal for children placed with a relative or non-relative. After the first thirty days, the frequency of contacts may be modified to no less frequently than every thirty days for a child placed with a relative or non-relative.

*Instructions and Considerations:* The case manager or the CPI, depending on the Early Services Intervention (case transfer) agreement, must make these periodic contacts. The CPI maintains the responsibility for contact until the Early Services Intervention (case transfer) staffing occurs.

**Rating:**

- ✓ Document “9” if the child was seen by the CPI at least once every seven days or as required above.
- ✓ Document “7” or “5” if the child was seen by the CPI, but the frequency was less than every seven days, based on the child’s needs and safety in their placement.
- ✓ Document “0” if the child was not seen by the CPI at least once every seven days during the period of time the CPI maintained responsibility for this contact.
- ✓ Document “NA” if the Early Services Intervention staffing occurred prior to seven days after the CPI removed, and the agreement identifies the services worker as having responsibility for weekly contact with the child and/or caregiver.

*Reference:* 65C-30-001(16), F.A.C., 65C-30.007(3)(a)(b), F.A.C., Well Being Outcome 1, Item 19