Action 4 Child Protection

Florida Department of Children and Families Case Review February 2016

Review Completed by Action for Child Protection

Southeast Region Overview

Date: 2/11/2016

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. Cases were randomly selected from three 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 FSFN access provided by the Department.

This report provides:

- Summary of key findings for the five main focus points of the review: Present Danger, Information Collection, Impending Danger, Safety Determination and Safety Planning.
- Data profile for cases reviewed within the South East Region for CPI.

Sample Size: 14 Assessments

Present Danger Assessment

Data Summary

- Total of 5 (38%) cases were identified by the review team case information indicated present danger.
- Total of 5 (38%) cases were identified by the worker indicated present danger.
- This resulted in a difference of 0 (0%) cases between the review team identification of present danger and the worker identification of present danger.

Strengths

- There were several cases where the present danger assessment provided specific detail regarding the worker's assessment to support the assessment.
- There were no cases identified where information was not present to determine present danger.
- Where present danger was identified there was a high degree of consistency in the identified present danger threats between the review team and the CPI.

Areas for Consideration

- The need for subsequent present danger assessments was noted as an area of concern for several cases.
- When present danger plans were developed, 40% of the plans were not sufficient to manage the present danger. Plans frequently relied upon the parents to control the danger or if the children were sheltered, the plan did not provide any provisions for contact or actions.



Blue Represents Data from July 2015

Orange Represents Data from February 2016

Information Collection

Data Summary

- 67% of the cases reviewed were found to have sufficient information collection in at lease one or more information collection domains.
- 54% of the cases reviewed were found to have sufficient information collection in all six domains.

Strengths

- Information collection for child functioning, adult functioning, parenting general, maltreatment, and nature of maltreatment were similarly rated for sufficiency.

- For cases where information was determined to be sufficient, cases were found to have adequate and good quality information.
- Child functioning domain continues to have the highest percent of cases with sufficient information within the FFA.

Areas for Consideration

- Information collection for parenting discipline was determined to be the lowest.
- For some cases where the family dynamics were complex, the FFA did not reflect the assessment of the family condition and lacked utilization of collaterals to support the information collection.
- In one case the FFA was completed on a family that was not available and should have been identified as unable to locate.



Blue Represents Data from July 2015

Orange Represents Data from February 2016

Impending Danger Assessment

Data Summary

- Total of 5 (38%) cases were identified by the review team as impending danger.
- Total of 7 (54%) cases were identified by the worker as impending danger.
- This resulted in a difference of ***2 (16%)*** cases between what the review team identified as impending danger and the worker identified as impending danger. During the July 2015 review, there was also a case difference of two cases. However in July, the review team identified two cases as having impending danger that the CPI had not identified as impending danger.

- Total of 2 (15%) cases were identified by the review team as not containing sufficient information to determine impending danger. During the July 2015 review the review team identified 7 cases that did not contain sufficient information to support decision making.

Strengths

- Cases were information was determined to be of good quality and sufficient supported the identification of caregiver protective capacities and the danger threats.
- When danger threats were identified, high degree of consistency with review team in the identification of an accurate danger threat.

Areas for Consideration

- For cases where present danger was identified, the FFA often lacked focus and detail regarding the assessment of impending danger.



Blue Represents Data from July 2015

Orange Represents Data from February 2016

Safety Decision

Data Summary

- For all cases reviewed the reviewers found that 83% *of the cases that were identified as safe by the worker were accurate.*

- In 23% of the total cases reviewed, the review team was not able to identify if the safety decision (either safe or unsafe) was accurate based upon the information in the case record.
- The review team identified three cases where the information in the assessment was not able to be determined to support the safety decision.

Strengths

- Several cases where information was sufficient, the safety decision was accurate.
- When children were found to be unsafe by the worker, there was a high degree of consistency with the review team safety determination.

Areas for Consideration

- Several cases lacked information to inform the safety decision for impending danger and for cases where there was present danger, the decision regarding safety was often associated to the present danger.

Safety Decision



Blue Represents Data from July 2015

Orange Represents Data from February 2016

Safety Planning

Data Summary

- A total of 6 cases were reviewed for safety plans. In those cases, 66% were identified as having detail and sufficiency to control for danger threats. This is a decrease of 44% since the July 2015 review.
- For applicable cases, conditions for return were logical, attainable, and relevant 50% of the time. This is a 50% decrease since the July 2015 review.

Strengths

- For cases where information was available, the safety planning analysis were supported.

Areas for Consideration

- Conditions for return were often treatment focused and not related to the safety planning analysis or in some cases were not developed.



Southeast Region

Last Modified: 02/09/2016

Filter By: Report Subgroup

1. D. Region

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Central Region		0	0%
2	Northwest Region		0	0%
3	Northeast Region		0	0%
4	Southern Region		0	0%
5	Southeast Region		14	100%
6	Suncoast Region		0	0%
	Total		14	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	5
Max Value	5
Mean	5.00
Variance	0.00
Standard Deviation	0.00
Total Responses	14

2. 1. Present Danger Assessment

Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total Responses
a.) Did the worker identify present danger at any point in the investigation process?	5	8	0	13
b.) Reviewer judgment: Was there information to indicate present danger in this case?	5	7	0	12

3. 3. Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to present danger? Check all that apply. If present danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified

column blank. Identify any present danger safety threats you believe existed in the case.

Question	Reviewer Identified	Worker Identified	Total Responses
Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child or the caregiver intended to seriously injure the child.	0	0	0
Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained, or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0	0	0
The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions seriously endanger a child's physical health.	0	0	0
There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and /or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates harm.	2	1	3
Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's essential medical	0	0	0

needs and the child is/has already been harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.			
Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian is unwilling or unable to manage.	0	0	0
Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	3	3	6
Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food clothing and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	2	2	4
Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0	0	0
Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0

4. 4. Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?

Answer		Response	%
Yes		5	100%
No		0	0%
Total		5	100%

5. 5. Reviewer judgment: Was a present danger safety plan needed in this case?

Answer		Response	%
Yes		0	0%
No		0	0%
Cannot determine		0	0%
Total		0	0%

6. 6. Reviewer judgment: Was the present danger safety plan sufficient to control the present danger threats identified?

Answer		Response	%
Yes		3	60%
No		2	40%
Total		5	100%

7. This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of information collection. Reviewers should be evaluating the information in the FFA in regards to the sufficiency criteria for each domain. Reviewer should select "YES" if information is clearly documented and sufficient for decision making within the Family Functioning Assessment . Reviewer should select "NO, information is present but not sufficient" if the concepts are noted in the Family Functioning Assessment but the information is not sufficient to support decision making. Reviewer should select "NO, information not present" if the worker did not include the concepts in the Family Functioning Assessment. This decision is based upon the review of the Family Functioning Assessment as

recorded in FSFN by the CPI. Case notes are reviewed, however reviewer determination is based solely on FFA completed. Feedback notes should indicate if the case record either negated or supported decision making not otherwise reflected in the FFA.

#	Question	YES, Information is Sufficient	NO, Information is present but not sufficient	NO, Information is not present	Total Responses	Mean
1	a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	9	4	0	13	1.31
2	b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	9	4	0	13	1.31
3	c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	7	4	2	13	1.62
4	d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	8	4	1	13	1.46
5	e. Adult functioning	8	5	0	13	1.38

	(How does the adult function on a daily basis? Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).					
6	f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	11	1	1	13	1.23

8. This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select "YES" if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select "NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select "NO, information not present" to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.

Answer		Response	%
Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information		10	77%
No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.		3	23%
No, Information is not present to assess the Caregiver Protective Capacities.		0	0%
Total		13	100%

9. Impending Danger

Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	Total Responses
a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	7	6	0	13
b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	5	6	2	13

10. Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to impending danger? Check all that apply. If impending danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any impending danger threats you believe exist in the case.

Question	Reviewer Identified	Worker Identified	Total Responses
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child, or the caregiver intended to seriously harm the child.	0	0	0
Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0	1	1
The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions endanger a child's physical health.	0	0	0
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	0	0	0
Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention	0	0	0

and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian/caregiver is unwilling or unable to manage.			
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously in way that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	3	6	9
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food, clothing, and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	3	2	5
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0	0	0
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0	0	0
Other.	0	0	0
There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family	0	0	0

is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and/or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates serious harm.			

11. Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.

Answer		Response	%
Yes		4	50%
No		4	50%
NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer		0	0%
Total		8	100%

12. Safety Decision

Question	Safe	Safe: Impending Danger Being Managed by Protective Parent/Legal Guardian	Unsafe	Cannot determine	Total Responses
a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	6	0	7	0	13
b.) Reviewer judgment	5	0	5	3	13

13. Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with theCPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?

Answer		Response	%
Yes		8	67%
No		4	33%
Total		12	100%

14. Reviewer: Does the family proceed to case management services due to an unsafe child or child that is safe with impending danger being managed?

Answer		Response	%
Yes		6	46%
No		7	54%
Total		13	100%

15. 1. Safety Plan:

Question	No	Yes, In-Home Safety Plan	Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	Total Responses
a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	0	0	6	0	6
b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	0	0	4	2	6

16. 2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.

Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	Total Responses
Does the safety planning analysis and justification clearly support the type of safety plan developed.	4	2	0	6

17. 3. Safety Plan: Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services.

Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	Total Responses
Is the safety plan detailed and sufficient level of effort to control for danger threats?	4	1	1	6

18. 4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented.

Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	Total Responses
Conditions for return are logical and attainable and relevant to the safety planning analysis and justification.	3	3	0	6

19. Did this case proceed to completion of a Family Functioning Assessment?

Answer		Response	%
Yes		13	93%
No		1	7%
Total		14	100%

20. Explain the reasoning for the family functioning assessment not being completed and reviewer analysis regarding the decision.

Text Response
There was a present danger assessment completed but there was no FFA based on "Other non jurisdiction". It was not clear why this determination was made but it does not appear that there were any safety threats to the child that were not being addressed by the parent who lived in the state.

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	1

SER Broward 2016

Last Modified: 02/11/2016

Filter By: Report Subgroup

1. B. FSFN ID

Text Response
101193541
101279727
100133699
2301439
100086275
100467042
3515790
101214968
100562291
100193298
101258336

2. C. Report Date

Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
07/27/2015
09/21/2015
07/13/2015
07/14/2015
07/31/2015
08/15/2015
08/25/2015
09/14/2015
09/21/2015
08/30/2015
08/07/2015

3. D. Region

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Central Region		0	0%
2	Northwest Region		0	0%
3	Northeast Region		0	0%
4	Southern Region		0	0%
5	Southeast Region		11	100%
6	Suncoast Region		0	0%
	Total		11	100%

4. E. Circuit:

Text Response
17
17
17
17
17
17
17
17
17
17
17

5. F. County:

Text Response
Broward
Broward
Broward
Broward
Broward
Broward
Broward
Broward
Broward
Broward
Broward

6. 1. Present Danger Assessment

Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine	Total Responses
a.) Did the worker identify present danger at any point in the investigation process?	4	7	0	11
b.) Reviewer judgment: Was there information to indicate present danger in this case?	5	5	1	11

7. 3. Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to present danger? Check all that apply. If present

danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any present danger safety threats you believe existed in the case.

Question	Reviewer Identified	Worker Identified	Total Responses
Parent/Legal Guardian's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child or the caregiver intended to seriously injure the child.	0	0	0
Child has a serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained, or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0	0	0
The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions seriously endanger a child's physical health.	1	2	3
There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and /or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates harm.	0	0	0
Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting the child's	0	0	0

essential medical needs and the child is/has already been harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.			
Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian is unwilling or unable to manage.	0	0	0
Parent/Legal Guardian is violent, impulsive, or acting dangerously in ways that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	4	3	7
Parent/Legal Guardian is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food clothing and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	2	1	3
Parent/Legal Guardian is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	0	0	0
Parent/Legal Guardian views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0

8. 4. Did the worker initiate a present danger safety plan when present danger was identified?

Answer		Response	%
Yes		4	100%
No		0	0%
Total		4	100%

9. 5. Reviewer judgment: Was a present danger safety plan needed in this case?

Answer		Response	%
Yes		0	0%
No		0	0%
Cannot determine		0	0%
Total		0	0%

10. 6. Reviewer judgment: Was the present danger safety plan sufficient to control the present danger threats identified?

Answer		Response	%
Yes		4	100%
No		0	0%
Total		4	100%

11. This section is concerned with evaluating the sufficiency of information for the six domains of information collection. Reviewers should be evaluating the information in the FFA in regards to the sufficiency criteria for each domain. Reviewer should select “YES” if information is clearly documented and sufficient for decision making within the Family Functioning Assessment . Reviewer should select “NO, information is present but not sufficient” if the concepts are noted in the Family Functioning Assessment but the information is not sufficient to support decision making. Reviewer should select “NO, information not present” if the worker did not include the concepts in the Family Functioning Assessment. This decision is based

upon the review of the Family Functioning Assessment as recorded in FSFN by the CPI. Case notes are reviewed, however reviewer determination is based solely on FFA completed. Feedback notes should indicate if the case record either negated or supported decision making not otherwise reflected in the FFA.

Question	YES, Information is Sufficient	NO, Information is present but not sufficient	NO, Information is not present	Total Responses
a. Extent of alleged maltreatment (What is the extent of the maltreatment?)	6	4	0	10
b. Nature of maltreatment? (What surrounding circumstances accompany the maltreatment?)	7	3	0	10
c. Parenting disciplinary practices (What are the disciplinary approaches used by the parent, including the typical context?)	3	2	5	10
d. General parenting (What are the overall, typical, pervasive parenting practices used by the parent? Do Not Include Discipline.)	3	6	1	10
e. Adult functioning (How does the adult function on a daily basis?	5	5	0	10

Include behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament).				
f. Child functioning (How does the child function on a daily basis? Include pervasive behaviors, feelings, intellect, physical capacity and temperament.)	3	7	0	10

12. This question is concerned with evaluating the assessment of caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select "YES" if information supports the identified caregiver protective capacities. Reviewer should select "NO, information is present but identified Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information. Worker may have selected caregiver protective capacities that are accurate, however may have selected others that are inaccurate or not supported by the information as being present, but rather absent. Reviewer should select "NO, information not present" to support the assessment of caregiver protective capacities when information is absent from the record to inform the caregiver protective capacities.

Answer		Response	%
Yes, Caregiver Protective Capacities are supported by information		5	50%
No, Caregiver Protective Capacities are not supported by the information.		5	50%
No, Information is not present to assess the Caregiver Protective Capacities.		0	0%
Total		10	100%

13. Impending Danger

Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine- Lack of Information	Total Responses
a.) Did the worker identify impending danger at the conclusion of the Family Functioning Assessment?	5	5	0	10
b.) Reviewer Judgment: Does the information collected indicate impending danger in this case?	5	2	3	10

14. Which of the following Safety Threats were identified due to impending danger? Check all that apply. If impending danger has not been identified, leave Worker Identified column blank. Identify any impending danger threats you believe exist in the case.

Question	Reviewer Identified	Worker Identified	Total Responses
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver's intentional and willful act caused serious physical injury to the child, or the caregiver intended to seriously harm the child.	1	0	1
Child has serious illness or injury (indicative of child abuse) that is unexplained or the parent/legal guardian/caregiver explanations are inconsistent with the illness or injury.	0	0	0
The child's physical living conditions are hazardous and a child has already been seriously injured or will likely be seriously injured. The living conditions endanger a child's physical health.	0	0	0
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting the child's essential medical needs and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	1	1	2
Child shows serious emotional symptoms requiring intervention	0	1	1

and/or lacks behavioral control and/or exhibits self-destructive behavior that the parent/legal guardian/caregiver is unwilling or unable to manage.			
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is violent, impulsive or acting dangerously in way that seriously harmed the child or will likely seriously harm the child.	3	4	7
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is not meeting child's basic and essential needs for food, clothing, and/or supervision and the child is/has already been seriously harmed or will likely be seriously harmed.	3	2	5
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver is threatening to seriously harm the child; is fearful he/she will seriously harm the child.	1	1	2
Parent/Legal Guardian/Caregiver views child and/or acts toward the child in extremely negative ways and such behavior has or will result in serious harm to the child.	0	0	0
Other.	0	0	0
There are reports of serious harm and the child's whereabouts cannot be ascertained and/or there is reason to believe that the family	0	0	0

is about to flee to avoid agency intervention and/or refuses access to the child and the reported concern is significant and indicates serious harm.			

15. Reviewer judgment: the information collected is adequate and reflects good quality to support: a) a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning and b) to support and justify decision making. For safety intervention decisions, the information must be enough to identify, support, reconcile and justify the presence or absence of threats to safety and to inform and justify the kind of safety plan/safety management that occurs or that a safety plan or safety management is unnecessary.

Answer		Response	%
Yes		4	80%
No		1	20%
NA-No Impending Danger Identified by Worker or Reviewer		0	0%
Total		5	100%

16. Safety Decision

Question	Safe	Safe: Impending Danger Being Managed by Protective Parent/Legal Guardian	Unsafe	Cannot determine	Total Responses
a.) What was the worker's safety decision?	5	0	5	0	10
b.) Reviewer judgment	2	0	4	4	10

17. Is there evidence the CPI Supervisor was regularly consulting with theCPI, recommending actions when concerns are identified, and ensuring recommended actions followed up on urgently?

Answer		Response	%
Yes		5	50%
No		5	50%
Total		10	100%

18. Reviewer: Does the family proceed to case management services due to an unsafe child or child that is safe with impending danger being managed?

Answer		Response	%
Yes		5	50%
No		5	50%
Total		10	100%

19. 1. Safety Plan:

Question	No	Yes, In-Home Safety Plan	Yes, Out-of-Home Safety Plan	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	Total Responses
a.) Was a Safety Plan developed in this case?	0	1	4	0	5
b.) Reviewer judgment: Was a safety plan necessary in this case?	0	1	3	1	5

20. 2. Safety Planning Analysis Safety Plan Justification: Accurate, logical and understandable to inform the type of safety plan developed.

Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	Total Responses
Does the safety planning analysis and justification clearly support the type of safety plan developed.	4	1	0	5

21. 3. Safety Plan: Safety plan is able to control for danger. Services and level of effort are detailed to include persons responsible for safety services.

Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	Total Responses
Is the safety plan detailed and sufficient level of effort to control for danger threats?	4	1	0	5

22. 4. Conditions for Return: Conditions address the safety planning analysis determinations that were keeping the child from remaining in the home and the conditions for return are realistic and will allow for an in home safety plan to be implemented.

Question	Yes	No	Cannot Determine-Lack of Information	Total Responses
Conditions for return are logical and attainable and relevant to the safety planning analysis and justification.	1	1	2	4