

## Chapter 12

## DOCUMENTATION AND REVIEW OF SCREENED-OUT CHILD INTAKES

12-1. Purpose. This chapter describes procedures for documentation and review of reports to the Florida Abuse Hotline that are not accepted for investigation.

12-2. Documentation Requirements. When a counselor makes the decision to screen out a report of alleged abuse, neglect, or abandonment that does not meet acceptance criteria, the counselor will document a screened-out intake in FSFN.

a. The counselor must search for all participants in FSFN before creating new persons in order to avoid creating duplicate persons and to ensure that there are no open intakes that must be sequenced.

b. All information that could compromise the reporter's identity must be confined to the reporter narrative.

c. A maltreatment code must be selected for the intake due to FSFN system requirements. For intakes that are screened out because the allegations do not meet the statutory definition for a maltreatment, the counselor should select the maltreatment code that most closely fits the allegations.

d. The allegation narrative must clearly and accurately reflect the information obtained from the reporter and must be objective and neutral in tone.

e. For Institutional intakes, the counselor shall search for the institution or provider in FSFN. If the institution or provider is found, it shall be linked to the intake on the Allegations tab.

f. On the Decision tab, the counselor will select a reason code that corresponds to the counselor's rationale for screening out the report. There are eight reason code options:

(1) Alleged Juvenile Sexual Offender Between Ages 13-17. This reason code is no longer applicable to Special Conditions intakes for Child on Child Sexual Abuse and should not be selected for any screened-out intake.

(2) Caregiver Statutory Guidelines Not Met. The alleged perpetrator does not meet statutory criteria. [NOTE: This reason code will not apply to allegations of human trafficking.]

(3) Created in Error. An intake is created incorrectly and must be screened out (e.g., an Adult Intake is created and saved but the counselor intended to create a Child Intake). The counselor must remove any participants who have been added to the intake, add two Unknown participants (one victim and one alleged perpetrator), and type "Created in error" into both the reporter narrative and the allegation narrative as the only added text in the intake.

(4) DJJ. A reporter makes a complaint about a Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facility that does not meet statutory criteria for abuse, neglect, or abandonment (e.g., a child in DJJ custody reports that she does not like the food at the facility). When the DJJ reason code is selected, a notification of the complaint is sent to the DJJ Inspector General's office via email.

(5) Does Not Rise to the Level of Reasonable Cause to Suspect. A reporter makes an allegation in which the child and alleged perpetrator meet jurisdictional criteria, but the allegation does not constitute abuse, neglect, or abandonment by statutory definitions.

(6) No Means to Locate. The report meets all of the intake acceptance criteria except that the reporter could not provide a means to locate and a search of all available systems did not yield a means to locate.

(7) Out of State Inquiry. There are allegations of abuse, neglect, or abandonment of a child who does not reside in Florida.

(8) Victim Statutory Guidelines Not Met. The alleged victim of abuse or neglect is under 18, but does not meet the other jurisdictional criteria for a child (born, not emancipated or married).

g. In the field below the selected reason code on the Decision tab, the counselor must document their rationale for screening out the intake.

h. If the intake is screened out due to Caregiver Statutory Guidelines not Met, the counselor must ensure that the box is checked for "Send a Florida Administrative Message to Law Enforcement."

### 12-3. Review of Screened Out Intakes.

a. Hotline supervisors and Quality Assurance personnel must conduct routine reviews of screened out intakes and the accompanying calls, faxes, or web-based reports. Supervisors are responsible for routine monitoring of screened-out intakes within their units.

b. Quality Assurance personnel are required to review screened-out calls, fax reports, and web-based reports to the Hotline whenever three or more screened-out reports are received on a single child.

(1) When an intake is generated in FSN which includes a child who has been a participant in two or more prior screened-out intakes, a "Three Hits" hyperlink will appear next to the child's name on the third intake. Clicking on the hyperlink prompts a window to appear which contains links to the prior intakes that were screened out.

(2) When a "Three Hits" hyperlink appears in an intake that a counselor intends to screen out, the counselor must notify a supervisor. The supervisor must review the three intakes and approve the screening decision. If the third intake is screened out, the supervisor will send a Three Hit Review notification to Quality Assurance.

(3) Quality Assurance must then review the three or more calls, fax reports, and/or web reports to determine if the screening decision was correct and to assess for harassment. In addition to reviewing the intakes, the Quality Assurance personnel will listen to the original call(s) and/or view the original fax or web document(s) to determine if any information was omitted from the intakes.

(4) If the totality of the concerns and/or any of the prior screened-out intakes indicates that an investigation is warranted, a new intake will be screened in. The Quality Assurance personnel screening in the intake shall document the rationale for their screening decision in the comment field on the Decision tab.

(5) If there are indications of harassment by a reporter, Quality Assurance will refer the concerns to general counsel for further review. The following may be taken into consideration when determining if there are indicators of harassment:

(a) Whether the three or more reports were made by the same reporter or multiple reporters.

(b) The reporter's relationship to the family.

(c) The reporter's expressed motivation for making a report or calling in multiple reports.

(d) Whether a professionally mandated reporter has called in any of the three reports either independently or at the behest of the person who made the other report(s).

(e) History of the reporter perpetrating domestic violence against a person involved in the report. This may include prior history in FSFN.

(f) Prior Three-Hit reviews or history in FSFN in which the same reporter was suspected of harassment.

(g) Prior history in FSFN of investigations in which the investigator documented suspected harassment by the reporter.

