

## ***Safety Plan Evaluation Tool***

This tool is utilized to review the sufficiency of the impending danger plan. Highlighted areas provide reference to CFOP, best practice, examples or clarification.

### **Danger Threat Description**

**1. Does the Danger Threat Description identify the danger threat(s) and describe the specific behaviors? Are the specific behaviors described attributed to the perpetrator of that behavior? Explain:**

(The danger threat is written using observable behaviors, not in child welfare terms. For example: “the father’s impulsive behaviors led to an altercation with the mother” should instead be, “the father, John Smith, drank two bottles of wine, got in an argument with the mother, Amy Smith, and started punching her in the face resulting in the mother having to be hospitalized with a broken jaw and head trauma. Amy said John hit her so many times that she lost count. This was the third time the father has been arrested for assaulting the mother resulting in the mother being physically injured in the last year. The police report indicated their three-year-old daughter, Jennifer Smith, was present and witnessed the assaults.”) \*\*See #3 regarding IPV Safety Plan Requirements

**2. Can you identify in this statement how the danger crosses the safety threshold causing harm or likely to cause harm to a vulnerable child?**

#### **Describe Observable:**

(The mother’s broken jaw and head trauma resulting from the father’s repeated punches are observable. The father’s continued history of arrests for Domestic Violence resulting in injury to the mother are observable.)

#### **Describe Severe:**

(The mother’s injuries resulting from the father’s most recent violent assault led to hospitalization for a broken jaw and head trauma demonstrates severity. Severity is also indicated by the three documented arrests due to the father’s multiple injurious assaults against the mother in front of their three-year-old daughter in the past year.)

#### **Describe Imminence:**

(The father’s three arrests for violently assaulting the mother and causing injury in front of the child determine this is not an isolated incident.)

#### **Out of Control:**

(Despite the mother’s efforts, the father’s violent behaviors continue to pose unacceptable danger to the child which cannot be safely managed without outside intervention.)

#### **Vulnerable child:**

(The three-year-old is dependent on adults for protection.)

**3. Does this statement reflect family collaboration?**

(The individual family members should be participants in crafting this statement. Does the statement use only child welfare language (impulsive behaviors) or add the language a parent used to describe the event (i.e. punched) instead? In cases with IPV, the collaboration needs to be completed individually, first with the survivor and then the perpetrator.)

4. If Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) is suspected or identified, did the CPI or Case Manager follow CFOP 170-7 Chapter 4 located at [http://centerforchildwelfare.org/kb/DCF\\_Pol/CFOP\\_170/CFOP170\\_7-Ch4.pdf](http://centerforchildwelfare.org/kb/DCF_Pol/CFOP_170/CFOP170_7-Ch4.pdf)

Consultation with a DV Advocate	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Safety plan developed with the survivor first	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Safety actions developed for child visitation/contact	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Safety actions developed for transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
All Safety Actions are the responsibility of persons other than the parent/legal guardian or child	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Safety Actions developed for children at times when they are with the survivor	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Safety Actions identified to remain confidential from perpetrator marked on the "Survivor only" safety plan only in FSFN	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Safety concerns discussed with survivor prior to developing safety plan with perpetrator	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Safety concerns discussed regarding proposed safety service providers before including them in the plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Dependable safety service providers identified who can maintain confidentiality from the perpetrator	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Perpetrator safety plan discussed with survivor to address any concerns	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Safety Actions developed for children at times when they are with the perpetrator	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA
Safety actions developed to protect the child from other perpetrator dynamics, such as the withholding of financial support and inappropriate communications	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA	More intrusive plan developed as the Perpetrator refuses to participate in the development of a safety plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
A copy of the "Child Safety Plan" and the Chapter 39 Injunction provided to law enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA	Sought Chapter 39 injunction, as required, when perpetrator of domestic violence is found not the parent or legal custodian to one or all child(ren)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA
Sought a Chapter 39 injunction for the perpetrator of domestic violence who is found to be the parent or legal custodian to one or all child(ren)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA	Actions to monitor Chapter 39 injunction included in the Child Safety Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA
Two separate plans one for the "survivor only" and one for the "perpetrator" <b>signed and uploaded</b> into the FSFN Safety Plan Module	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The plan is marked as "complete" to freeze and activate	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

### Actions to Keep the Child Safe

5. Describe how the safety plan controls for danger around visitation or family contact?

(For in-home and out-of-home plans, visitation/family contact are times when the child(ren) are more vulnerable to the danger threat. If the parent/legal guardian's behavior is so out of control that "24/7" supervision is necessary, then it is required to be an out-of-home plan. The actions on the safety plan need to manage and control for the danger during these times. For judicial cases, court ordered contact should be referenced as such. Rilya Wilson applies to all judicial cases for children ages 0-6 enrolled in a child care setting. Child care providers must be notified with expectations set for contacting the CPI or CM if the child has unexcused absences. Best practice makes all child care providers and schools aware of the allowed contact and visitation to assist as safety service monitors to control for the danger.)

An impending danger safety plan is still required for a family made arrangement which is a voluntary and temporary (short-term) separation safety action initiated by the parent/legal guardian to a responsible adult of their choosing to provide daily care and supervision of the child(ren). The parent(s) retain full legal responsibility and access to the

children. It is not a family-made arrangement if at any time the CPI or CM directs the parent/caregiver as to what the arrangement should be or if the CPI or CM directs that access by the parent/caregiver is to be restricted.

**6. Do the safety plan actions exemplify the Case Manager's understanding of how the danger manifests? Do they address the specific behaviors identified in the Danger Threat Description?**

(Example unrelated to previous Danger Threat: Actions on the safety plan support the danger threat with each action correlating to the danger it is controlling. Actions are written in behaviorally specific terms. For example: Instead of, "The maternal grandfather, Adam Brown, will control for the domestic violence if the father, Mike Johnson, comes to the home to see the mother or children" use, "the maternal grandfather, Adam Brown, will secure the children, call law enforcement and then the CPI/CM if the father, Mike Johnson, comes to the home to see the mother or children." If we can determine that the danger manifests (father becomes violent and controlling) only when the father drinks alcohol, then a safety action may include the mother and child leaving and staying the night with the grandfather when the father starts drinking.)

**7. Which Safety Management Categories/Safety Actions were utilized?**

(Generally, there are two Safety Management actions utilized, Supervision and Monitoring and Separation. Bringing attention to the other categories may allow for an in-home safety plan to be put into place. Please refer to CFOP 170-7 Chapter 8 located at [http://centerforchildwelfare.org/kb/DCF\\_Pol/CFOP\\_170/CFOP170\\_7-Ch8.pdf](http://centerforchildwelfare.org/kb/DCF_Pol/CFOP_170/CFOP170_7-Ch8.pdf) for the safety management services.)

**8. If Friendly Visiting or Social Connections were utilized, did the plan specifically provide the purpose of this Safety Service as well as the tasks to complete if there was a concern?**

(Example unrelated to previous Danger Threat: "Pastor Williams will stop by three times a week," should be written as, "Pastor Williams will stop by unannounced, at a minimum of three times a week to speak with the father, Mr. Sanchez, about maintaining his sobriety. If the father appears to be under the influence, the Pastor will contact the Case Manager and have the mother and child stay with him until the father is sober.)

**9. Did the Case Manager provide relationships, emergency contact information, their own contact information and the on-call contact information if they could not be reached?**

(Best practice is to make the safety plan self-explanatory to anyone who reads it. The full names and relationships need to be provided on the safety plan. If aunt Irma Smith is the caregiver, then she should be listed as the aunt. If she is a friend of the family, she should be listed as such. First and last names identifying the person responsible for the safety action, their relationship to the child, and their contact information is important to have another child welfare professional or law enforcement fully understand the plan. There are times when a Case Manager may be unavailable so alternative contact information of a supervisor or on-call worker should be made available on the plan. If the case is judicial the court order regarding visitation and contact should be attached so law enforcement can be called to enforce the safety plan if there is a violation.)

**10. Does the safety plan have a child responsible for their own or other children's safety?**

(Children, no matter how mature, should never be responsible for managing their own safety, or the safety of their siblings from the impending danger. There must always be a reliable adult, aligned with the child, responsible for the safety action. At times, a DV advocate may have a child have an action or a task on an IPV safety plan they develop with the survivor and child. That is a different and confidential IPV safety plan that is kept separate from the impending danger

safety plan developed by child welfare. The actions on these plans must not be included in case notes, or any court documents that are discoverable to the perpetrator at trial, as they may unintentionally release confidential safety actions, code words, or plans of protection to the perpetrator.)

**11. Does the safety plan have parent promises as safety actions?**

(Parents are not in charge of safety plan actions. If they can manage the safety, impending danger no longer exists. We may have the parent participate in the plan but a responsible adult will oversee their assigned action or task. For example, the grandfather, George Jones, will ensure the mother, Monica Jones, gives her child, Layla Jones, her prescribed medication, albuterol, at 6pm daily. The mother is completing the task, but the grandfather is responsible for supervision and monitoring of the task.)

**12. Do the safety service providers selected have realistic tasks?**

(24/7, sight & sound, etc... are unrealistic as people have personal care times)

**13. Is the safety plan at the appropriate level of intrusiveness?**

(If supervision is needed 24/7 then separation is warranted. The safety analysis questions to determine the level of intrusiveness need to be evaluated frequently to determine the level of intrusiveness.)

**14. Is the frequency of intervention described specifically or does it say...ongoing?**

(Ongoing is not a time frame. Is it to be done daily? Weekly? More Specifically, will it be completed randomly, a minimum of three times a week or will it be on Monday, Tuesday, and Friday afternoons. If the parent can predict the timeframe you will be monitoring, then random supervision and monitoring does not control or manage the danger.)

**15. How old is the safety plan? Is there evidence to support it is actively being managed (review case notes)?**

(This question is for a supervisor review but could also be used by the case manager as a self-evaluation. The case notes should reflect discussions regarding how the actions are being managed with the safety service providers, children if age appropriate and parents.)

**16. Is the Safety Plan entered into the safety plan page in FSFN with a signed safety plan saved as an image attached to the plan? Is it marked as "complete"?**

(The signed safety plan images need to be uploaded into FSFN and marked as complete, then saved. This will freeze the safety plan into action. If a plan needs to be modified, the current and active safety plan needs to be terminated and a new safety plan is created.)

**17. Is there a documented Supervisor Case Consultation Associated with the Safety Plan implementation? Does it address two-way communication?**

(This question is for a supervisor review. A supervisor consultation and signature are required for all safety plans. Best practice is documenting the case consultation in the case notes. Please refer to CFOP 170-7 Chapter 2 for Supervisor Consultation and requirements around present danger safety plans.)

[http://centerforchildwelfare.org/kb/DCF\\_Pol/CFOP\\_170/CFOP170\\_7-Ch2.pdf](http://centerforchildwelfare.org/kb/DCF_Pol/CFOP_170/CFOP170_7-Ch2.pdf) and chapter 3 for Impending Danger  
[http://centerforchildwelfare.org/kb/DCF\\_Pol/CFOP\\_170/CFOP170\\_7-Ch3.pdf](http://centerforchildwelfare.org/kb/DCF_Pol/CFOP_170/CFOP170_7-Ch3.pdf)