

**CALIFORNIA  
SDM® INTAKE  
SUPERVISORY REFERRAL READING TOOL**

**Referral Name:** Maria Conseco  
**Referral Date:** 8 / 22 / 2015  
**Worker Name:** Student 10  
**Reviewer Name:** Supervisor Sam

**Referral Number:** 3274-9660-1704-7000036  
**Date of Case Reading:** 3 / 25 / 2016  
**Review Date:** 3 / 25 / 2016

**PRELIMINARY SCREENING TOOL**

**1. Was the screening tool completed according to policy?**

- Yes. Completed according to policy.  
 No. *Provide details:*

One tool completed on the day of referral, per policy. Both screening and response priority completed as required.

Two reports received within a short period and entered into CMS as separate referrals—second referral adds additional information relevant to the first but is regarding same incident. *Local county policies would be followed regarding whether a second referral record was entered OR if additional information would be added to the first referral. Likely second referral would have been preliminary screened as duplicate in many counties.*

**2. Was Step I: Preliminary Screening completed appropriately?**

- Yes. Review of screening criteria is not required, and this was selected.  
 Yes. Preliminary screening criteria did not apply and were not selected.  
 No. *Provide details:*

*Note: If second report was entered as a new CMS referral, preliminary screening, duplicate report, would likely apply.*

**3. Does the record narrative match item scores?\***

- Yes. Narrative supports all criteria selected.  
 Yes. No criteria in Step II are selected, and none should have been selected.  
 No. *Provide details:*

Screeener narrative indicated child had multiple bruises and reported that "her daddy hurt her last night." Which meets the criteria for non-accidental or suspicious injury, other injury. Additional information provided in second report regarding child needing immediate medical attention due to symptoms of shock would meet the criteria for non-accidental or suspicious injury, severe.

No information to support marking any item in general neglect screening criteria.

- Area of strength  
 Area of opportunity  
 Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

Screeener narrative provided information about reporting party's observations of injuries and child statements that helped to meet definition for physical abuse. Consider crafting of a provisional harm statement.

Can screeener narrative include specific efforts to gather additional information, rather than simply stating "no further information provided"?

\*Refer to enhanced practice elements and pay careful attention to definitions when evaluating this item.

**For reports in which Step II, CPS Screening Criteria was completed and should have been completed:**

**4. Was the correct screening decision reached?**

- Yes. Referral was screened out, and narrative supports decision.
- Yes. Referral was screened in, and narrative supports decision.
- No. *Provide details:*

In-person response was correct based upon current injuries and child statement.

**5. Was a response accurately selected regarding sexually exploited and/or sex trafficked information?**

- Yes. Referral details required a response, and one was selected.
- Yes. A response was not required, and neither were selected.
- No. *Provide details:*

**6. Does the tool recommendation match the action taken?**

- Yes. Final screening tool recommendation matches the recommendation in CWS/CMS.
- No. *Provide details:*

## RESPONSE PRIORITY

Complete only for reports that were screened in.

### Not applicable/report was screened out

#### 1. Was the response priority tool completed according to policy?

- Yes. Completed according to policy, AND an automatic 24-hour response was selected.
- Yes. Completed according to policy, AND the appropriate decision tree was completed.
- No. *Provide details:*

Tree for physical abuse was appropriately completed but incorrectly coded based on narrative. Item "prior history of physical abuse" should have been marked, not "child vulnerable or fearful."

Tree for general neglect should not have been completed, as it did not meet screening criteria.

#### 2. Were the response priority questions completed correctly based upon record narrative?\*

- Yes.
- No. *Provide details:*

See above. In addition, there was no information in the narrative about child being fearful.

- Area of strength
- Area of opportunity
- Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

Ensure that narrative models structure of the response priority tree when drafting narrative.

#### 3. Is the final tool recommendation correct?

- Yes.
- No. *Provide details:*

#### 4. Does the tool recommendation match the action taken?

- Yes. Priority was accurately assigned, and all answers were accurate.
- Yes. Priority was accurately assigned even though not all items were completed accurately.
- No. *Provide details:*

\*Refer to enhanced practice elements and pay careful attention to definitions when evaluating this item.

No, insufficient narrative. *Provide details:*

**PATH OF RESPONSE DECISION**

*For differential response counties only*

**Not applicable/not a differential response county**

**1. Was the path decision tool completed according to policy?**

Yes. Path decision tool was completed within required timeframes and on the correct household.

No. *Provide details:*

**2. Were path decision tool questions completed correctly based on record narrative?\***

Yes. All items were marked or not marked consistent with available narrative and CWS/CMS records.

No. *Provide details:*

Area of strength

Area of opportunity

Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

**3. Is the final tool recommendation correct?**

Yes. All items were scored correctly, OR any differences in item scores would not have affected final recommendation.

No. *Provide details:*

**4. Does the tool recommendation match the action taken?**

Yes. Tool-recommended path and CWS/CMS-recommended path are the same.

No. *Provide details:*

\*Refer to enhanced practice elements and pay careful attention to definitions when evaluating this item.

**CALIFORNIA**  
**SDM®INVESTIGATION/ASSESSMENT AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE**  
**SUPERVISORY REFERRAL CASE READING TOOL**

**Referral Name:** Maria Conseco  
**Referral Date:** 8 / 22 / 2015  
**Worker Name:** Student 10  
**First Face-to-Face Contact:** 8 / 22 / 2015

**Referral Number:** 3274-9660-1704-7000036  
**Review Date:** 3 / 25 / 2016  
**Reviewer Name:** Supervisor Sam  
**Referral Close Date:** 8 / 25 / 2015

**SAFETY**

*If a safety assessment and safety plan were completed for an additional household, please review on a separate case reading form.*

**Unable to locate family.** *(If selected, please choose another referral to review.)*

**1. Was the tool completed according to policy?**

Yes. Completed according to policy.

No. *Provide details:*

Safety assessment was dated 8/23/15, the day after the children were protectively placed, so date should have been 8/22/15.

**2. Does the date of the safety assessment match the date of the first face-to-face contact?**

Yes.

No. *Provide details:*

**3. Does the narrative support the worker's answer to the header question about Native American ancestry?**

Yes.

No. *Provide details:*

No information in narrative related to ICWA inquiry to support a "no" response.

**4. Does the narrative support the worker's answers in the child vulnerabilities section?**

Yes.

No. *Provide details:*

"Age 0-5" correctly marked but criteria were met for "diminished mental capacity;" this should also be marked because Peter was described as having Down syndrome.

**5. Does the narrative support the safety threats identified?\***

- Yes. No safety threats were identified within the narrative, and the safety decision of "Safe" was correct.
- Yes. Safety threats were identified and supported by the narrative, including specific caregiver behaviors and their impact/potential impact on the child or children.
- No. *Provide details:*

While Safety Threat item 1 was correctly marked based upon narrative, the subcategory "serious injury or abuse to child other than accidental" should have been selected instead of excessive discipline or physical force.

Item 4 regarding hazardous living conditions has insufficient information to support marking because there is no information about whether the tools are within reach of children.

- Area of strength
- Area of opportunity
- Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

Insufficient narrative related to interviews. Work to structure investigation narrative using both the abuse allegations and the structure of the safety assessment. Attend to providing information linking caregiver action/inaction and impact on children. No information regarding exploration of support network or safety planning.

**6. Does the narrative support identified caregiver complicating behaviors?\***

- Yes. No caregiver complicating behaviors were identified within the narrative, and none were marked on the safety assessment.
- Yes. Complicating behaviors were identified and supported by narrative.
- No. *Provide details:*

- Area of strength
- Area of opportunity
- Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

**7. Are the identified household strengths and protective actions supported by the narrative?\***

- Yes. Household strengths and protective actions were supported in narrative, as was their appropriate use in safety planning.
- No. *Provide details:*

No information in narrative to support marking any item. No evidence in narrative of efforts to safety plan or explore in-home safety interventions.

\*Refer to enhanced practice elements and pay careful attention to definitions when evaluating this item.

- Area of strength
- Area of opportunity
- Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

See notes above. Consider using Three Questions structure in interview and narrative to explore supporting strengths and protective actions as well as to identify support network and immediate next steps.

**8. Are the in-home protective interventions supported by the narrative?\***

- Yes. Safety threats and complicating behaviors (if applicable) were identified, and safety decision was "Safe with plan." A safety plan was developed with at least one parent.
- No. *Provide details:*

No information in narrative to support and no evidence of efforts to safety plan using in-home protective interventions in the narrative.

- Area of strength
- Area of opportunity
- Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

See above.

**9. Was a safety plan completed appropriately? (See item definitions and enhanced practice elements for needed elements.)**

- N/A. Safety plan was not needed/developed.
- No. Safety plan was written but does not include needed elements.
- Yes. Safety plan was written and includes needed elements.

*Details:*

No evidence in the narrative of efforts to safety plan or safety plan writing even though safety decision was safe with a plan.

- Area of strength
- Area of opportunity
- Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

Ask worker about efforts to inquire about Madelyn's biological father as a potential safety planning resource.

\*Refer to enhanced practice elements and pay careful attention to definitions when evaluating definitions when this item.



**10. If the safety decision was "Unsafe," is the placement intervention supported by the narrative?**

- N/A. Safety decision was either "Safe" or "Safe with plan."
- Yes. Safety decision is "Unsafe," and a placement intervention was selected.
- No. *Provide details:*

**11. Was the final safety decision correct?**

- Yes.
- No. The final decision was incorrect. *Provide details:*

Based upon narrative, decision should have been unsafe.

**12. Does the final recommendation match the action taken?**

- Yes.
- No. Decision was "Safe" or "Safe with plan," but child was removed.
- No. Decision was "Unsafe," but child remained in home.
- No. Decision was "Safe with plan," and child remained in the home; but there was no safety plan, OR safety plan does not adequately address all safety factors.

**13. Should another safety assessment have been completed during the referral because conditions changed?**

- Yes.
- No.

**13a. If yes, was another safety assessment completed?**

- Yes. *(Please review the next completed safety assessment on a separate case reading form.)*
- No.

**14. Did the worker accurately identify other households that may have required the completion of an additional safety assessment?**

- Yes. Worker accurately identified an additional household, and the household was appropriately assessed for safety. *(Please review the additional completed safety assessment on a separate case reading form.)*
- Yes. Worker accurately identified no additional households; therefore, no additional safety assessments were needed.
- No. Another household was identified in the narrative; however, the worker did not complete an additional safety assessment.

**15. Is there evidence in the record that the worker discussed safety assessment results with the family?\***

- Yes.
- No. *Provide details:*

\*Refer to enhanced practice elements and pay careful attention to definitions when evaluating this item.

- Area of strength
- Area of opportunity
- Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

## RISK ASSESSMENT

**N/A.** If referral was unfounded and county policy does not require risk assessment for unfounded referrals, mark this box and do not proceed with review. It is not necessary to select another referral for review unless risk assessments have not been reviewed for two months.

### 1. Was the tool completed according to policy?

Yes. Completed according to policy.

No. Provide details:

Completed too soon.

### 2. Were the risk assessment questions completed correctly based upon record narrative?\*

Yes.

No. Provide details:

Items 1, 2, 5, 8, 11, and 13 were coded incorrectly based upon narrative. Policy override for severe non-accidental injury should have applied based upon narrative.

Area of strength

Area of opportunity

Area of demonstrated growth

Details:

### 3. Are overrides supported by narrative?\*

Yes. An override was selected and is supported by narrative.

Yes. No override was selected and none should have been, as supported by narrative.

No. An override was selected and is NOT supported by narrative.

No. No override was selected, and information in the narrative indicates one should have been.

Details:

Severe non-accidental injury applied.

Area of strength

Area of opportunity

Area of demonstrated growth

Details:

\*Refer to enhanced practice elements and pay careful attention to definitions when evaluating this item.

**4. Is the final tool recommendation correct?**

- Yes. The final recommendation was correct.
- No. The final recommendation was incorrect. *Provide details:*

**5. Does the final tool recommendation match the action taken?**

- Yes.
- No. Risk was low or moderate with no safety factors, but case was opened with no/inadequate explanation provided.
- No. Risk was low or moderate with safety factors, but case was not opened and no/inadequate explanation was provided.
- No. Risk was high or very high, but case was not opened and no/inadequate explanation was provided.

**6. Is there evidence in the record that the worker discussed risk assessment results with the family?\***

- Yes. Narrative includes information indicating the worker shared results with the family.
- Yes. Narrative includes information indicating the worker attempted to share results with the family.
- No. *Provide details:*

- Area of strength
- Area of opportunity
- Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

\*Refer to enhanced practice elements and pay careful attention to definitions when evaluating this item.

**CALIFORNIA  
SDM® VOLUNTARY/COURT INTAKE  
SUPERVISORY CASE READING TOOL**

**Referral Name:** Maria Conseco

**Referral Number:** 3274-9660-1704-7000036

**Referral Date:** 8 / 22 / 2015

**Review Date:** 3 / 25 / 2016

**Worker Name:** Student 10

**Reviewer Name:** Supervisor Sam

**Date of Face-to-Face for FSNA Contact:** 8 / 22 / 2015

**Referral Close Date:** 8 / 25 / 2015

**FAMILY STRENGTHS AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

**1. Was the tool completed according to policy?**

Yes. Completed according to policy.

No. *Provide details:*

Date of assessment was not the same as face-to-face contact for family strengths and needs assessment (FSNA) interview.

**2. Were the FSNA domains completed correctly based upon record narrative?\***

Yes. All items marked are supported by narrative.

No. Narrative does not support items marked.

No. Narrative includes information that an item should have been marked, but was not.

No. *Provide details:*

No narrative detail regarding discussion of cultural and household context. SN3 should have been coded as d based upon narrative. No evidence for coding SN5 and SN6.

Area of strength

Area of opportunity

Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

**3. Is the final assessment of priority needs and strengths correct?**

Yes. The final assessment recommendation is correct.

No. *Provide details:*

No evidence that substance abuse was an issue for the mother. Key areas to address are support system and household relationships.

\*Refer to enhanced practice elements and pay careful attention to definitions when evaluating this item.

**4. Does the assessment recommendation match the action taken?**

- Yes. Case plan addresses all priority need areas AND builds on strengths.
- No. Case plan does not address priority needs, AND/OR strengths were not considered.
- No. Case plan includes objectives that are unrelated to priority needs.
- No. *Provide details:*

Too many objectives and many not related to the primary issues of assuring that the caregiver protects children from physical abuse by others.

**4a. Does the case plan show evidence of behaviorally descriptive objectives and/or a goal statement that is relevant to safety threats and risk?\***

- Yes.
- No. *Provide details:*

- Area of strength
- Area of opportunity
- Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

Narrative and case plan should also include information related to child domains.

\*Refer to enhanced practice elements and pay careful attention to definitions when evaluating this item.

**CALIFORNIA  
SDM® FAMILY MAINTENANCE REVIEW  
SUPERVISORY CASE READING TOOL**

**Referral Name:** Maria Conseco  
**Referral Date:** 8 / 22 / 2015  
**Worker Name:** Student 10  
**First Face-to-Face Contact:** 9 / 2 / 2015

**Referral Number:** 3274-9660-1704-7000036  
**Review Date:** 3 / 25 / 2016  
**Reviewer Name:** Supervisor Sam  
**Referral Close Date:** 8 / 25 / 2015

**SERVICE PERIOD CASE NOTE REVIEW**

**1. Does each case note show evidence that worker explained the method for reassessment?\***

- Yes.
- No. *Provide details:*

- Area of strength
- Area of opportunity
- Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

Discuss strategies with worker regarding using the structure of the reassessment to inform monthly contacts and supporting narrative.

**2. Does each case note show evidence of the risk reassessment structure?\***

- Yes.
- No. *Provide details:*

- Area of strength
- Area of opportunity
- Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

\*Refer to enhanced practice elements and pay careful attention to definitions when evaluating this item.

**3. Does each case note show evidence of engagement strategies?\***

Yes.

No. *Provide details:*

Area of strength

Area of opportunity

Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

\*Refer to enhanced practice elements and pay careful attention to definitions when evaluating this item.



## RISK REASSESSMENT

### 1. Was the tool completed according to policy?

- Yes. Completed according to policy.
- No. *Provide details:*

Date of assessment should have corresponded to face-to-face contacts on 1/27/15 or 12/15/15.

### 2. Were the risk reassessment questions completed correctly based upon narrative support?\*

- Yes. All items marked are clearly supported by narrative.
- No. Narrative conflicts with item marked.
- No. Item is marked, but no narrative supports selection.
- No. There are discrepancies in item selected and information in narrative.
- No. *Provide details:*

- Area of strength
- Area of opportunity
- Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

### 3. Are overrides supported by narrative?\*

- Yes. An override was selected and is supported by narrative.
- Yes. No override was selected, and none should have been, as supported by narrative.
- No. An override was selected and is *not* supported by narrative.
- No. No override was selected, and information in the narrative indicates that one should have been.

*Provide details:*

- Area of strength
- Area of opportunity
- Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

\*Refer to enhanced practice elements and pay careful attention to definitions when evaluating this item.

**4. Is the final tool recommendation correct?**

- Yes. All items were scored correctly, OR any difference in scoring would not have affected the final recommendation.
- No. One or more errors were made in scoring items, AND this led to a recommendation that is different than what a properly scored tool would have recommended.

**5. Does the tool recommendation match the action taken?**

- Yes.
- No. Risk was low or moderate with no safety factors, but case remained open with no/inadequate explanation provided.
- No. Risk was low or moderate and there were safety factors, but case was closed and no/inadequate explanation was provided.
- No. Risk was high or very high, but case was closed and no/inadequate explanation was provided.

**6. Is there evidence in the record that the worker discussed risk reassessment results with the family?\***

- Yes.
- No. *Provide details:*

- Area of strength
- Area of opportunity
- Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

**7. Was a new FSNA needed to update the case plan?**

- Yes.
- No.

**If yes, was a new FSNA completed?**

- Yes. *If yes, complete the FSNA portion of this tool.*
- No. An FSNA was not completed.

**8. Was a case closing safety assessment needed?**

- Yes.
- No.

**If yes, was the case-closing safety assessment completed?**

- Yes. *If yes, complete the safety assessment portion of this tool.*
- No. A closing safety assessment was not completed.

\*Refer to enhanced practice elements and pay careful attention to definitions when evaluating this item.