

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

**Referral Name:** Ann Harding  
**Referral Date:** 8 / 22 / 2015  
**Worker Name:** Student 10  
**Reviewer Name:** Supervisor Sam

**Referral Number:** 3274-9660-1704-7000036  
**Date of Case Reading:**        /        /         
**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:*

Two referrals and two SDM hotline tools completed as appropriate.

**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:*

Duplicate referral criteria did not apply here additional information about severity of child's injuries affected response priority.

**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:*

Strong behavioral detail on observations of injuries in both referrals. Information regarding father's actions described as well as child's fearful demeanor.

In first referral, narrative met threshold for other injury.  
In second referral, narrative met threshold marked for severe injury, increasing to automatic 24 hour.

- Area of strength  
 Area of opportunity  
 Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

Consider including provisional harm statement in screener narrative. Consider additional questioning about family situation, using Three Questions format. Ask and provide detail about support system known to the reporter.

\*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:*

**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:*

Referral 1: Appropriate decision tree completed  
Referral 2: Automatic 24 hour

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

- Yes.
- No. *Provide details:*

Referral 1: Item was marked incorrectly that there is a non-perpetrating caregiver aware and demonstrating protection. Item should have been marked as "prior history of physical abuse" and "child is vulnerable or fearful" (crying) that would have prompted a 24-hour response.  
Referral 2: Automatic 24 hour.

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

*Details:*

Screeener narrative could include more detailed information about what is working well in household to assess if there was a non-perpetrating caregiver.

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

- Yes.
- No. *Provide details:*

Should have been 24 hours based upon response priority question.

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

**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:*

Worker responded immediately, not 10 days, in first referral. Second referral had correct response.

- 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 the 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:** Ann Harding  
**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:** \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

**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:*

Initial safety assessment completed at first face-to-face with child and updated when safety was reassessed and conditions changed.

**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:*

Both safety assessments marked "parent not available." While this was correct response in initial assessment, mother was available and no narrative mentioned inquiry. Follow up with worker to discuss reasons for ICWA inquiry at this decision point and importance of this in narrative documentation.

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

- Yes.  
 No. *Provide details:*

Updated safety assessment reflected additional knowledge regarding evaluation for 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 narrative, including specific caregiver behaviors and their impact/potential impact on the child or children.
- No. *Provide details:*

Clearly explained details of safety threat using caregiver action/impact on child, each safety threat item well described and the narrative was organized in the structure of the Safety Assessment.

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

*Details:*

Good example of well-written investigation narrative that incorporates structure of the safety assessment into narrative. Excellent and detailed description of nature of impact on child as related to identified caregiver actions. Consider use of provisional harm and danger statements.

**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/or 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:*

Narrative included information regarding why efforts to safety plan and evaluate household strengths and protective actions were not completed at initial safety assessment. Narrative detail available to support household strengths and protective actions in updated safety assessment.

\*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:

**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:*

The narrative included details of the safety plan but neglected to include the involvement of the network and that the only plan relies on a caregiver without a history of being able to protect. Good unit example to share as the details of the safety plan were included in the narrative.

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

Details:

Narrative included shared understanding of danger with parent and agreements about actions that will be taken to control danger. Area of demonstrated growth might include additional support network member to ensure that mother continues to maintain actions of protection. Consider adding a safety goal.

**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:

Consider adding additional monitoring with additional support network member.

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

Details:

Encourage worker to detail efforts to engage the family's network and add a safety goal.

\*Refer to enhanced practice elements and pay careful attention to definitions when evaluating 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:*

**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. (Madelyn's birth father's household)

**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:*

Conduct a search of the father to determine whether he is a capable non-offending parent and include a network member in safety planning.

## 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:*

Date of allegation conclusion was 8/25/15.

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

- Yes.  
 No. *Provide details:*

Item 1 should be b based on one prior neglect investigation. Item 10 at time of investigation should have been b, physically unsafe. Item 15 has no narrative to support response. Item 16 also has no narrative to support response.

- Area of strength  
 Area of opportunity  
 Area of demonstrated growth

*Details:*

Follow up with worker on (1) using risk items to prepare for interview, (2) including narrative support for all items marked, and (3) review of overrides.

### 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:*

Should have been "severe non-accidental injury." Follow up with worker on override and contact frequency guidelines.

- 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:** Ann Harding  
**Referral Date:** 8 / 22 / 2015  
**Worker Name:** Student 10  
**Date of Face-to-Face for FSNA Contact:** 10 / 6 / 2015

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

**FAMILY STRENGTHS AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

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

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

**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:*

Follow up with worker to ensure that child domains are included in case planning assessment section.

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

*Details:*

Worker described cultural context of household within social study. Case planning assessment provides a detailed summary of underlying needs and strengths related to safety threats.

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

- Yes. The final assessment recommendation is correct.
- No. *Provide details:*

\*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:*

Outstanding example of well-written behavioral case plan objectives that describe the presence of safety when achieved. Great work!

**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:*

Great example of excellent case planning that is well linked to a shared assessment!

\*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:** Ann Harding  
**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

**SERVICE PERIOD CASE NOTE REVIEW**

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

- Yes.
- No. *Provide details:*

No obvious detail in case notes, though case notes are structured using the case plan objectives, which implies that the worker and caregiver are focused on assessing progress based upon case plan objectives.

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

*Details:*

Nice job of structuring monthly case contacts based upon case plan objectives and providing behavioral detail about progress.

**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:*

Melissa was not listed as a household member. Add her to the assessment.

### 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:*

R10 meets criteria for b, not a.

- 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.

*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.