



**Florida Department of Children and Families RSF Case Review Quarter #3 2016**

**Review Completed by Action for Child Protection**


**Central Region**

**Date: 6/26/2017**

**Overview and Method**

Action for Child Protection, Inc. completed a case record review requested by the Florida Department of Children and Families to assess the implementation of the Florida Safety Methodology, in particular to explore the interrater reliability of the Critical Child Safety Practice Experts and decision making at case closure for cases identified as requiring Rapid Safety Feedback. Cases were randomly selected from the six regions in Florida and the sample was provided to Action for Child Protection. Cases were reviewed off-site by Action staff utilizing Qualtrics survey software and FSN access provided by the Department. This report provides a summary of key findings for inter-rater reliability for the CCSPE regarding present danger, present danger planning, present danger management, information collection, safety determination, supervisor consultation and case being on track.

**Present Danger Assessment: Item #2**



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	57.58%	19
2	No	42.42%	14
	Total	100%	33

## Data Summary


- This data represents the accuracy and agreement by the review team with the determination the CCSPE made at the point in time of their review of the case in regards to Item #2.
- Overall, for the point in time of the review, the review team determined that 58% (n=19) of the cases reviewed, that the CCSPE was accurate in their assessment regarding the sufficiency of the present danger assessment.

## Areas for Consideration

- Present danger sufficiency for Item #2 was rated by the CCSPE at 91% (n=30). At closure the review team identified 49% (n=16) of the cases were noted to be sufficient for the determination of present danger, based upon the present danger assessment.

## Present Danger Safety Planning Sufficiency: Item #3.0

---



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	87.88%	29
2	No	12.12%	4
	Total	100%	33

## Data Summary

- This data represents the accuracy and agreement by the review team with the determination the CCSPE made at the point in time of their review of the case in regards to Item #3.


- Overall, for the point in time of the review, the review team determined that 88% (n=29) of the cases reviewed, that the CCSPE was accurate in their assessment regarding the sufficiency of the present danger plan.

**Areas for Consideration**

- At case closure, the review team noted that the ratings regarding sufficiency of information for Item #3 decreased. This review was done solely on the case documentation at case closure by the review team.
- Present danger sufficiency for Item #3 was rated by the CCSPE at 30% (n=10). At closure the review team identified 18% (n=6) of the cases were noted to be sufficient for the determination of present danger plan, based upon the present danger plan completed in the case record.

**Present Danger Safety Management: Item #3.1**

---



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	93.94%	31
2	No	6.06%	2
	Total	100%	33

**Data Summary**

- This data represents the accuracy and agreement by the review team with the determination the CCSPE made at the point in time of their review of the case in regards to Item #3.1.


- Overall, for the point in time of the review, the review team determined that 94% (n=31) of the cases reviewed, that the CCSPE was accurate in their assessment regarding the sufficiency of management of the present danger safety plan.

**Areas for Consideration**

- Of particular concern is that at case closure, the review team noted that the ratings regarding sufficiency of information for Item #3.1 were unchanged. This review was done solely on the case documentation at case closure by the review team.
- Present danger safety plan management for Item #3.1 was rated by the CCSPE at 27% (n=9). At closure the review team identified 21% (n=7) of the cases were noted be managed for safety during the period of time the present danger plan was in effect.

**Information Collection: Item# 5.0-5.6**

---



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	57.58%	19
2	No	42.42%	14
	Total	100%	33

**Data Summary**

- This data represents the accuracy and agreement by the review team with the determination the CCSPE made at the point in time of their review of the case in regards to Item #5.0-5.6.
- Overall, for the point in time of the review, the review team determined that 58% (n=19) of the cases reviewed, that the CCSPE was accurate in their assessment regarding the sufficiency of information collection.

## Areas for Consideration

- Of particular concern is that at case closure, the review team noted that the ratings regarding sufficiency of information for all Items #5.0-5.6 decreased. This review was done solely on the case documentation at case closure by the review team.
- Table 1 represents the CCSPE review findings.
- Table 2 represents review team findings at case closure. Highlighted figures represent an increase or no change in ratings between the CCSPE and review team. Across all domains, the sufficiency of information at case closure was noted to be have decreased from the point in time of the review conducted by the CCSPE.


**Table 1. CCSPE Review: Domains**

#	Question	Yes		No		Not Rated	
1	5.1 Extent of the alleged maltreatment	20.31%	26	16.67%	7	0.00%	0
2	5.2 Nature of maltreatment	17.97%	23	23.81%	10	0.00%	0
3	5.3 Child Functioning	18.75%	24	4.76%	2	25.00%	7
4	5.4 Adult Functioning	16.41%	21	11.90%	5	25.00%	7
5	5.5 Parenting General	13.28%	17	21.43%	9	25.00%	7
6	5.6 Parenting discipline/behavior management	13.28%	17	21.43%	9	25.00%	7
	Total	Total	128	Total	42	Total	28

**Table 2. ACP Review: Domains**

#	Question	Yes		No		Not Rated	
1	5.1 Extent of the alleged maltreatment	20.25%	16	18.68%	17	0.00%	0
2	5.2 Nature of maltreatment	17.72%	14	20.88%	19	0.00%	0
3	5.3 Child Functioning	20.25%	16	10.99%	10	25.00%	7
4	5.4 Adult Functioning	13.92%	11	16.48%	15	25.00%	7
5	5.5 Parenting General	12.66%	10	17.58%	16	25.00%	7
6	5.6 Parenting discipline/behavior management	15.19%	12	15.38%	14	25.00%	7
	Total	Total	79	Total	91	Total	28

## Family Functioning Assessment and Safety Decisions: Item #8



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.67%	22
2	No	33.33%	11
	Total	100%	33


### Data Summary

- This data represents the accuracy and agreement by the review team with the determination the CCSPE made at the point in time of their review of the case in regards to Item #8.0
- Overall, for the point in time of the review, the review team determined that 67% (n=22) of the cases reviewed, that the CCSPE was accurate in their assessment regarding the sufficiency of information collection.

### Areas for Consideration

- Of particular concern is that at case closure, the review team noted that the ratings regarding the safety decision, Item #8, decreased. This review was done solely on the case documentation at case closure by the review team.
- Safety determination accuracy for Item #8 was rated by the CCSPE at 76% (n=25). At closure the review team identified 42% (n=1) of the cases were noted to have safety determinations that were supported by the FFA.

## Supervisor Consultation and Guidance: Item #10



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	87.88%	29
2	No	12.12%	4
	Total	100%	33

### Data Summary

- This data represents the accuracy and agreement by the review team with the determination the CCSPE made at the point in time of their review of the case in regards to Item #10.0
- Overall, for the point in time of the review, the review team determined that 88% (n=29) of the cases reviewed, that the CCSPE was accurate in their assessment regarding the supervisor consultation and guidance.

### Areas for Consideration

- Of particular concern is that at case closure, the review team noted that the ratings regarding supervisor consultation, Item #10, decreased. This review was done solely on the case documentation at case closure by the review team.
- Supervisor consultation, when occurring, was frequently noted to lack the depth and breadth of guidance needed in relation to the case dynamics.
- Table 3 identifies the CCSPE review findings for Item #10.
- Table 4 identifies Action Review team findings for Item #10.

**Table 3. CCSPE Review for Item #10**


#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	45.45%	15
2	No	54.55%	18
	Total	100%	33

**Table 4. ACP Review for Item #10**

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	33.33%	11
2	No	66.67%	22
	Total	100%	33

**Investigation on Track: Item #11**

---



#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	100.00%	33
2	No	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	33

## **Data Summary**

- This data represents the accuracy and agreement by the review team with the determination the CCSPE made at the point in time of their review of the case in regards to Item #11.0
- Overall, for the point in time of the review, the review team determined that 100% (n=33) of the cases reviewed, that the CCSPE was accurate in their assessment regarding the investigation being on track.

## **Areas for Consideration**

- The CCSPE identified 86% of the applicable cases were on target based upon the CPI and CPIS information during the consultation.
- At closure, and review of the case by ACP also identified 86% of the applicable cases remained on target and were completed, as outlined in the consultation and actions conducted by the CPI and CPIS.

## **Summary of Findings:**

Action Review team identified a high degree of consistency in regards to the reviews completed by the CCSPE, both for partially and fully completed reviews. CCSPE's provided accurate and detailed feedback to CPI and CPIS's that were aligned with practice and were appropriate based upon the case record and information provided during the case consultation.

Despite the guidance being provided by the CCSPE during the case consultations and subsequent written reviews, frequently cases did not reflect information shared during the consultations and actions identified by the CCSPE not being completed prior to the investigation being closed. In particular, in regards to information collection documented in the family functioning assessment and subsequently the supporting information regarding the safety determination.

Supervisor consultation was noted to be insufficient for the majority of cases reviewed and for cases that were noted to be on track during the consultation, actions were not completed upon case closure.