EVIDENT CHANGE

Inform Systems. Transform Lives.

CALIFORNIA SDM® CASE READING MANUAL

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

August 2021

Structured Decision Making® and SDM® are registered in the US Patent and Trademark Office.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO CHILD PROTECTION SUPERVISORY REFERRAL/CASE READING

Goals

- Improve Structured Decision Making® (SDM) assessment completion.

- Improve documentation.

- Increase decision-making consistency.

- Improve decision-making accuracy.

- Increase use of casework practices that include families in assessment and decision making.

Objectives

- Increase systematic, objective appraisal of knowledge and skills within and across child welfare services.

- Support workers' integrated use of SDM® assessments and enhanced engagement practices with families.

- Identify opportunities for learning.

- Identify examples of excellence.

Supervisory referral/case reading involves the detailed reading of a small, random sample of records for a specific set of criteria. This enables supervisors—who understand the strengths and needs of workers within their unit but rarely have time to review the written record in detail for each referral or case—to serve as evaluators and, more importantly, as clinical mentors for their staff. Supervisors also frequently consult on referrals and cases to help their staff make decisions based on information provided by a worker. Supervisors can use this information to inform objective evaluations of their staff and lead their units to improve and enhance their practices.

This manual will help supervisors locate the relevant case reading tool, definitions, and policies and procedures for conducting reviews on the units they supervise. For each review, a small segment of the record is examined. The policies and procedures section describes how to select records and the portion of the record to review.

USING CASE READING RESULTS

The primary purposes of case reading are to strengthen workers' skills and support the use of enhanced practice methods in conjunction with SDM assessments. This is best achieved when each worker learns what he/she is doing well and what can be improved upon, within an environment that recognizes existing strengths and encourages growth. Ideas for discussion include the following.

- **Individual Consultation**

    » Review and critique specific reporting decisions with the worker who completed them.

    » Highlight successes.

    » Review definitions and/or policies that may have been misunderstood.

    » Consider whether any professional development is indicated in knowledge, skill, or value areas related to SDM practice, based on worker feedback and review patterns over time.

    » Support integrated use of SDM assessments with families.

- **Group Consultation**

    » Consider addressing any issues that are observed across several workers in a unit meeting. For example, if *multiple staff* consistently screen in instances of neglect related to inadequate supervision that do not meet the threshold, or consistently screen out instances of physical abuse related to excessive discipline that do meet the threshold, meet to review definitions and be sure everyone understands them.

    » Consider providing additional training in any subject area that seems difficult for multiple workers. For example, if several workers have difficulty scoring the emotional/behavioral health item, offer a discussion on how to observe infants/children for signs of mental health impairment.

    » Ask for permission to review, as a unit, assessments that were completed exceptionally well, and use them to point out desirable skills.

    » Use group consultation as a process for professional practice growth within the unit.

- **General**

    » Avoid focusing on following rules for rules' sake.
    » Focus on core casework principles and developing pride in the work.

Additional Case Reading Options

Program Manager or Quality Assurance Case Reading
A program manager or quality assurance staff member selects a random sample of cases reviewed by supervisors and conducts an independent review. The case reading tools completed by the program manager/quality assurance staff member and by the supervisor are compared and discussed.

Peer Case Reading
Supervisors from one unit read cases from another unit. This could be within a program (e.g., emergency response [ER] supervisor reads from another ER unit) or across programs (e.g., ER supervisor reads from a family reunification [FR] unit). This is particularly helpful to do on occasion for the three following reasons.

- Cases are often discussed informally. It is difficult to ignore previously received verbal information and rely solely on written documentation when conducting a case review. However, a supervisor from a different unit will know only what is written.

- When reading from another program, the reader is not influenced by knowledge of informal practices and can therefore be more objective. He/she may have additional insights that reflect the importance of narrative and case records for another downstream or upstream unit.

- Peer case reading increases consistency across units.

Evident Change Comparative Case Reading
Evident Change staff work onsite to conduct an independent review of a random sample of supervisor-reviewed cases. The case reading tools completed by CRC staff and by the supervisors are compared and discussed.

SUPERVISION CONSIDERATIONS

It is important for workers to learn what they are doing well and what can be improved upon, within an environment that recognizes existing strengths and encourages growth. When supervisors provide clear feedback, craft solution-focused questions, engage workers in developing professional goals that are behaviorally specific, and clearly understand what is being evaluated, they model the enhanced practice methods that workers are expected to use in their everyday casework. Supervisory modeling of these enhanced practice methods can both improve the quality of feedback provided to workers and encourage the use of these methods in workers' day-to-day practice and casework with families.

Each referral/case reading tool offers an opportunity for supervisors to provide feedback and specifically note areas of **strengths** and **opportunity**. It also can be used to support a conversation about **action steps**, not only for the worker, but for the supervisor or program manager to consider as a part of building a true culture of continuous quality improvement (CQI). Using this tool can help structure direct feedback to workers and identify steps that can be taken to enhance practice skills and support improved system functioning.

- <u>Area of Strength</u>: Identify a specific area in which the worker excelled, as evidenced in the case referral review. Select "Area of strength" and provide specific information or reference to the area of strength. For example, the narrative may have been "well written" and identified as a strength. A more useful review would include behaviorally specific information, such as, "Narrative included the voices of the child and a support network member, as well as the parent."

- <u>Area of Opportunity</u>: Identify a specific area in which the worker may be able to utilize skills to enhance his/her practice. Select "Area of opportunity" and provide specific information or a reference to the area that may need additional training or practice. For example, the narrative did not support an item selected on an assessment. Useful feedback for this example may be, "Narrative does not contain behaviorally specific information about the parent's ability to utilize community resources."

  Providing this type of feedback also may be beneficial by highlighting areas of opportunity for the organization. If multiple workers have the same "area of opportunity," a need for additional training in that area may be indicated.

- <u>Identified Action Steps</u>: Identifying specific strengths and opportunities for growth sets the foundation for a collaborative conversation with the worker about next steps. Next steps may be centered around a skill that was identified as an area of opportunity, or next steps for the supervisor, such as seeking policy clarification on an area of practice or bringing a training to the larger team. Conversation about action steps should always include asking the worker in what ways the supervisor and the organization as a whole could support improved practice, as a critical part of building a CQI culture.

It is important to *pay close attention to the definitions* for the questions that relate specifically to the narrative, as the definition may provide additional considerations for inclusion relating to enhanced practice methods. When providing feedback to workers, supervisors can model enhanced practices with use of reflective inquiry, shared and balanced assessment of the three areas, and shared planning for growth.

Supervision Handout Example

	Comments
What are the areas of strength?	The assessment was completed according to policy, and the narrative demonstrates that Worker X was using enhanced practice methods to engage the family in safety planning. This was evidenced by the description of the family meeting that took place and the narrative supporting that Worker X explained the process and purpose of safety planning to the family, as well as the mother's follow-up questions about who could be involved. Worker X shows that identifying and including safety network members in safety planning meetings is a strength, as evidenced by this narrative and past practice.
What are the areas of opportunity?	Some inconsistencies appeared in what Worker X included in the narrative and what was selected on safety interventions. It is important to be specific in the narrative as to what interventions will be put in place, as it is unclear as to how some of the safety threats may be mitigated. In this particular instance, without more information, it is difficult to tell if the interventions in place would appropriately address the safety threats selected on the safety assessment.
Identified Action Steps	Worker X will review safety interventions and continue efforts to provide detailed, corresponding, and behaviorally specific narratives such as the example listed above. Worker X describes a challenge in finding appropriate interventions to support domestic violence concerns, and requests additional support in thinking through what those might be. Supervisor X will bring this conversation about appropriate interventions for safety planning for safety threat 5 to the upcoming unit meeting, on X date, to brainstorm collective practice knowledge and increase consistency of practice. Supervisor X will also review with manager X ways to increase clarity in local policy to identify appropriate timelines for monitoring safety plans.

CALIFORNIA
SDM® CASE READING TOOLS
FEEDBACK SUMMARY

Case Reading Tool Completed:
○ Intake ○ Investigation/ER ○ Voluntary/Court Intake ○ Family Maintenance ○ Family Reunification

Worker Name: _____	**Reviewer Name:** _____
Report Name: _____	**Date of Case Reading:** _____
Supervisor Name: _____	**Date of Feedback:** _____

Comments	
Area(s) of Strength	
Area(s) of Opportunity	
Identified Action Steps	Social Worker:
	Supervisor:
	Program Manager/System Infrastructure:

ENHANCED PRACTICE ELEMENTS

While reviewing the narrative carefully, consider whether the enhanced practice elements displayed below are present and how the worker has both demonstrated AND documented use of these elements in practice.

Screening and Response	
Enhanced Practice Element	**Evidence**
Eliciting information from reporter by utilizing engagement skills, including: • Open-ended questions • Interviewing ladder • Asking about exceptions to the problem • Asking reporter about balance of family strengths, needs, and concerns • Asking reporter about possible impact of caregiver behavior on the child • Asking reporter about family's support network • Asking reporter about steps he/she has taken and is WILLING to take to address the concern • Closing with a safety scale and asking the reporter about what needs to happen to move the number up the scale by one or to a 10 (this could include asking reporter about expectations of next steps)	Narrative may include: • Reporter's perception of the impact the concerning behavior/incident has had on the child(ren) • Reporter's knowledge of family strengths • Reporter's knowledge of family's use of services • Reporter's perspective on family needs • Reporter's knowledge of the family's support network • Steps the reporter has taken to ensure immediate safety • Current location of child, if known • Issues that may impact the safety of responding workers (e.g., weapons, propensity to violence, dangerous animals) • Information on family's language, how the family identifies culturally

Safety	
Enhanced Practice Element	**Evidence**
Eliciting information from reporter by utilizing engagement skills, including: • Strengths-based approach • Asking about exceptions to the problem, behavioral details of the danger/safety threat • Use of family engagement skills using Three Questions structure (mapping) • Interviewing for danger (safety threat) and safety (actions of protection). (Remember that "actions of protection" may not constitute "safety" but may be steps toward safety that can be built upon.) • Shared understanding of danger and safety with caregivers • Use of support networks • Incorporate child's perspective • Caregiver actions/inactions and their impact on the child in the context of caregiver complicating behaviors	Narrative may include: • Behavioral details on the safety threats and history of protection • Behaviorally specific strengths and/or protective actions • Voice of the child in documentation • Identification and/or involvement of at least one support network member • Safety threats related to specific caregiver behaviors and their impact/potential impact on the child or children • Identified in-home interventions that relate directly to present safety threats • Evidence of the worker explaining the assessment process and results in a family-centered and culturally appropriate way

Safety Plan	
Enhanced Practice Element	**Evidence**
Eliciting information from reporter by utilizing engagement skills, including: • Orienting the family to what a safety plan is and why one is being created in this instance • Rigorous and family-centered safety plan development • Identification of actions that can be implemented immediately • Use of protective actions in safety planning • Use of support network and a family meeting with the support network if at all possible • Involvement of children in safety planning	Narrative and/or safety plan should include: • Evidence that one or more legal caregivers were actively engaged and involved in safety planning • Evidence of a shared understanding of the safety threat, the organization's perspective, and the immediate actions needed to control the safety threat. (Please note: This is not the same as "agreement" on the problem, which may not be reachable at this stage.) • A specific behavioral description (danger statement) of the identified safety threat marked on the safety assessment • Evidence of at least one support network member besides the caregiver and the individuals involved in the allegation included in the safety plan • Action steps on the safety plan that are observable, measurable, and related to a specific person who is responsible for implementing it • No services unless they are engaged in active steps to control for the safety threat • A specific plan to monitor the effectiveness of the safety plan • A time limit for review • Signatures or evidence of agreement to safety plan by at least one legal caregiver, the worker, and the support network member • Evidence of efforts to include/inform child of safety plans

Risk	
Enhanced Practice Element	**Evidence**
Eliciting information from reporter by utilizing engagement skills, including: • Rigorous, balanced, family-centered approach • Interviewing ladder and solution-focused questions • Use of risk results in shared decisions with family about case opening • Use of the risk assessment to help determine intensity of contact	Narrative may include: • Evidence of specific observations made by worker that support assessment items selected • Evidence that worker elicited information from family members, children, and network members • Evidence that the worker used scaling questions, narrative-anchored questions, perspective questions, and/or solution-focused questions to elicit information • Information regarding key items that contribute to higher risk that might be addressed in a case plan • Evidence of the worker explaining the assessment process and results in a family-centered and culturally appropriate way

Family Strengths and Needs Assessment	
Enhanced Practice Element	**Evidence**
Eliciting information from reporter by utilizing engagement skills, including: • Rigorous, balanced, family-centered approach • Interviewing ladder and solution-focused questions • Link to identified safety threat and risk factors • Behaviorally descriptive case plan objectives that describe caregiver behaviors that enhance safety • Goal statements • Progressive behavioral visitation plans • Use of support networks	Narrative may include: • Evidence that the caseworker discussed with the child and the parent/caregiver the cultural and household context and shared his/her perspective on how the household context either supports or challenges safety • Information supporting worker's efforts to engage family members in assessing caregiver and child domains • Evidence of the family's perspective and voice of the child • Information supporting worker's efforts to prioritize needs both the worker and family feel are important • Information supporting worker's efforts to have a discussion/shared agreements with family regarding results • Evidence that results of the family strengths and needs assessment (FSNA) have been shared with family as part of case plan development • Evidence of family participation in case plan development • Inclusion of a goal statement on the case plan • Elements on the case plan are behavioral and tied to the FSNA results

Reunification	
Enhanced Practice Element	**Evidence**

Eliciting information from reporter by utilizing engagement skills, including:
• Ensuring the family has a clear sense of the department's danger concerns (danger statement)
• Ensuring the family is clear about the goal they should be working toward (goal statement)
• Ensuring the family has a clear visitation plan in the least-restrictive setting. (Department may need to engage network or other agencies to ensure this occurs.)
• Ensuring the family is very clear about what they must demonstrate during visits to move to less restrictive visits and show they are addressing the concerns
• Rigorous, balanced, family-centered approach that includes:
  » Use of facilitation during contacts and meetings with families
  » Ensuring shared understanding of progress
  » Partnering with families in developing ongoing action steps and planning
  » Supporting the family in development of support networks
  » Use of progressive visitation
	Narrative may include:
	• Evidence of specific observations made by worker that support assessment items selected (especially regarding quality and quantity of visitation)
	• Evidence that worker elicited information from family members, children, and network members
	• Evidence that worker oriented family/caregiver to reunification process during first service period interaction
	• Development of a progressive visitation plan with clear markers for when increased and less-restrictive visitation can occur
	• Evidence that worker explained the reassessment process and structure to family including: risk, behavior-specific progress toward case plan goals, household safety, visitation frequency, and quality permanency planning
	• Evidence that the worker used scaling questions, narrative-anchored questions, perspective questions, and/or solution-focused questions to elicit information
	• Information regarding key items that contribute to higher risk that might be addressed in a case plan
	• Evidence of the worker explaining the assessment process and results in a family-centered and culturally appropriate way
	• Evidence that the worker-structured agenda for monthly case visits focused on reunification components, case plan objectives, visitation evaluation, and current safety in the home

Risk Reassessment	
Enhanced Practice Element	**Evidence**
Eliciting information from reporter by utilizing engagement skills, including: • Rigorous, balanced, family-centered approach • Use of facilitation during contacts and meetings with families • Shared understanding of progress • Ongoing action steps and planning • Development of support networks • Ongoing action steps and planning	Narrative may include: • Evidence of specific observations made by worker that support assessment items selected • Evidence that worker elicited information from family members, children, and network members • Evidence that the worker used scaling questions, narrative-anchored questions, perspective questions, and/or solution-focused questions to elicit information • Information regarding key items that contribute to higher risk that might be addressed in a case plan • Evidence of the worker explaining the assessment process and results in a family-centered and culturally appropriate way

CALIFORNIA
SDM® INTAKE
SUPERVISORY REFERRAL READING TOOL
POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Who	Supervisor responsible for intake/hotline workers
How Many Records	Two per worker per month
What Part of Record	FROM: Receipt of call TO: Submission of referral for supervisory approval
Selecting Records	On a randomly selected date for each worker each month, select the first two hotline tools submitted for approval. If county uses differential response, also look for path decision tool.

CALIFORNIA
SDM® INTAKE
SUPERVISORY REFERRAL READING TOOL

Referral Name: _____ **Referral Number:** _____
Referral Date: _____/_____/_____ **Date of Case Reading:** _____/_____/_____
Worker Name: _____ **Review Date:** _____/_____/_____
Reviewer Name: _____

PRELIMINARY SCREENING TOOL

1. Was the screening tool completed according to policy?
☐ Yes. Completed according to policy.
☐ No. *Provide details*:

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*:

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*:

☐ 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.

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:*

[ ]

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

☐ Yes.
☐ No. *Provide details:*

```
```

☐ Area of strength
☐ Area of opportunity
☐ Area of demonstrated growth

Details:

```
```

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:*

```
```

☐ No, insufficient narrative. *Provide details*:

```
```

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

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® INTAKE
SUPERVISORY REFERRAL READING TOOL
DEFINITIONS**

PRELIMINARY SCREENING TOOL

1.   Was the screening tool completed according to policy?

Source: Date of referral, date of assessment, and screener narrative.

<u>Answer YES if</u>:
The date on the screening tool is the same as the date of the referral in CWS/CMS (or no later than the next day for referrals received after 10:00 p.m.).

<u>Answer NO if</u>:
Completed too late. The date on the screening tool is not the same as the date of the referral in CWS/CMS. If the referral in CWS/CMS was entered after 10:00 p.m., consider the tool too late if the screening tool date is more than one day after the referral date.

2.   Was Step I: Preliminary Screening completed appropriately?

Source: Criteria marked AND the screener narrative.

<u>Answer YES if</u>:

- A review of screening criteria was not needed, and one of the following options was selected.

  » Evaluate out (no child under age 18; duplicate referral that contains no new information; referred to another county)

  OR

  » Safely surrendered baby

- Preliminary screening criteria did not apply and were not selected.

<u>Answer NO if</u>:

- Preliminary screening item was not selected, AND screener narrative supports that one should have been.

- Preliminary screening item was selected, AND screener narrative supports that it should not have been.

3. Does the record narrative match item scores?

Source: Criteria marked AND the screener narrative.

<u>Answer YES if</u>:

- All criteria marked are supported by screener narrative, AND the screener narrative does not suggest that additional item(s) should have been marked.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:

- Is there evidence of the worker using engagement techniques to elicit information from the person reporting the concern? For example, did the worker ask about worries and/or caller's perception of any family strengths?

- Is there evidence in the narrative regarding the reporter's perception of the impact the concerning behavior/incident has had on the child(ren) and/or family functioning?

<u>Answer NO if</u>:

- Criteria were marked or overridden without support.

    » Criteria are marked, but the screener narrative does not provide clear information to support marking them, according to the definition(s).

    » An override was marked, but there is no explanatory information in the screener narrative.

- At least one criterion or override should have been marked.

    » Criteria are NOT marked, but the screener narrative includes information that suggests they should have been marked, according to the definition(s).

    » An override should have been marked, according to the screener narrative, but was not.

    » Worker provided verbal information that was not reflected in narrative AND was not scored. The tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

Briefly describe any items that do not match the screener narrative.

4. Was the correct screening decision reached?

Source: Final recommendation compared to item scores and overrides.

Answer YES if:
All items were scored correctly, OR any differences in item scores would not have affected final recommendation.

Answer NO if:
One or more errors were made in scoring items, which led to a different recommendation than what a properly scored tool would have recommended.

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

Source: Criteria marked and screener narrative.

Answer YES if:
One of the following is selected, AND case narrative supports selection.

- Child has been commercially sexually exploited and/or sex trafficked while in placement.

- Child has been commercially sexually exploited and/or sex trafficked (not in placement).

Answer NO if:

- No criterion is selected, AND case narrative indicates that one should have been selected.

- Criterion is selected, AND case narrative indicates that it was selected inaccurately.

6.   Does the tool recommendation match the action taken?

Source: Final recommendation from the tool (after applying overrides) and CWS/CMS recommended response.

Answer YES if:
A correctly completed final screening tool recommendation matches the recommendation in CWS/CMS.

Answer NO if:

- Tool recommended in-person response, but CWS/CMS shows evaluated out.
- Tool recommended evaluate out, but CWS/CMS shows in-person response.

RESPONSE PRIORITY
If the screening tool led to a "screen out" response, or if the referral was screened out due to an override, mark N/A (not applicable) and do not complete the rest of the questions.

1. **Was the response priority assessment completed according to policy?**

Source: Criteria marked and screener narrative.

<u>Answer YES if</u>:

- The response priority was completed according to policy, AND case narrative supports an item selected that resulted in an automatic 24-hour response.

- The response priority was completed according to policy, AND the appropriate decision tree was completed.

<u>Answer NO if</u>:

- The case narrative supports an automatic 24-hour response, but a criterion was not selected.

- The case narrative does not support an automatic 24-hour response, but a criterion was selected.

- The appropriate decision tree was not completed.

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

Source: Look at the path through the decision tree(s) to determine how the worker answered each applicable question (Yes/No). Look at whether any overrides were applied. Compare tool responses to screener narrative.

<u>Answer YES if</u>:

- All yes/no answers are clearly supported by screener narrative, AND the use of overrides (or absence of overrides) is clearly supported by screener narrative.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:

- Is there evidence of the worker using engagement techniques to elicit information from the person reporting the concern?

- Does the narrative provide information on any of the following?
    » Reporter's knowledge of family strengths
    » Reporter's knowledge of family's use of services
    » Reporter's perspective on family needs
    » Reporter's knowledge of the family's support network

Answer NO if:

- One or more questions were answered "Yes" when screener narrative includes information suggesting the correct answer was "No"; OR question(s) was answered "No" when screener narrative suggests answer should have been "Yes."

- Screener narrative is insufficient to know whether any yes/no answer is correct.

- Override was applied, but the screener narrative does not contain information to support the override; OR the screener narrative suggests an override, but none was applied.

- Worker provided verbal information that was not reflected in narrative AND was not scored. The assessment and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

Briefly describe which questions and/or overrides are inconsistent with screener narrative.

3.   Is the final tool recommendation correct?

Source: Final recommendation compared to item scores and overrides.

Answer YES if:
All items were scored correctly, OR any differences in item scores would not have affected the final recommendation.

Answer NO if:
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.

4.   Does the tool recommendation match the action taken?

Source: Look at the final recommended response time. Look at the response time recommended in CWS/CMS. If county uses more specific response times, count all times that are within 24 hours as 24-hour responses and all times that are beyond 24 hours as 10-day. For example, a CWS/CMS three-day response would be considered consistent with an SDM response time of 10 days. A CWS/CMS two-hour response would be considered consistent with an SDM response time of 24 hours. Los Angeles County should read 10-day as five-day.

Answer YES if:
Recommended response on tool matches the recommended response in CWS/CMS.

Answer NO if:
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.

PATH DECISION *(Use only in counties using differential response.)*
If the screening tool led to evaluate out but the referral is being assigned due to an override, OR if the screening tool led to in-person response, but based on inability to locate family, referral will be evaluated out, mark N/A (not applicable) and do not complete the rest of the questions. If the county does not use differential response, mark *Not applicable/not a differential response county*. Do not complete the rest of the questions.

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

Source: Dates that referral was entered in CWS/CMS and path decision tool was completed, screener narrative, and participants.

Answer YES if:
Path decision tool was completed within required timeframes and on the correct household.

Answer NO if:
Completed too late.

- Referral was assigned as a 24-hour response and path decision tool was not completed immediately.

- Referral was assigned as a 10-day response and path decision tool was completed more than 24 hours after the referral was received.

- Referral was evaluated out, and path decision tool was completed more than five days after the referral was received.

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

Source: Look at the items marked on the path decision tool, the screener narrative, and the history of prior referrals. Other sources of information may include the list of children in the current referral and their birthdates. Be certain to examine records relating to the correct individuals/households. For example, if a person who previously lived in the household was an alleged perpetrator in a prior investigation, that prior record should *not* be counted. If an adult in the current household had a prior investigation, even if the victim(s) were children who do not live in the current household, it should be counted.

Answer YES if:
All items are marked or not marked consistent with available narrative and CWS/CMS records.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:

- Is there evidence of the worker using engagement techniques to elicit information from the person reporting the concern?

- Is there information within the narrative regarding the following?

    » Current location of child, if known

> » Issues that may impact the safety of responding workers (e.g., weapons, propensity to violence, dangerous animals)

> » Information on family's language, cultural identity

Answer NO if:

- A marked item lacks screener narrative to support it.

- Screener narrative suggests an item should have been marked, but it was not.

- More or fewer prior investigations are reported in CWS/CMS than are marked on the path decision tool.

- More or fewer children are in the home, OR the ages of the children do not match.

- A record of a prior open case on this household is not reflected on the path tool, OR the path tool reports a prior open case but CWS/CMS has no matching record.

- Worker provided verbal information that was not reflected in narrative AND was not scored. The tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

Briefly describe all items that do not match the narrative and/or case record.

3.   Is the final tool recommendation correct?

Source: Final recommendation compared to item scores and overrides.

Answer YES if:
All items were scored correctly, OR any differences in item scores would not have affected final recommendation.

Answer NO if:
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.

4.   Does the tool recommendation match the action taken?

Source: Recommendation of the tool and the recommendation reported in CWS/CMS.

Answer YES if:
Tool and CWS/CMS recommended same path.

Answer NO if:

- Tool recommended path 1 response, but CWS/CMS shows evaluated out.
- Tool recommended no response, but CWS/CMS shows path 1.

- Tool recommended path 2 response, but CWS/CMS shows path 3.
- Tool recommended path 3 response, but CWS/CMS shows path 2.

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

Who	Supervisor responsible for emergency response/assessment and investigations/court/dependency investigation workers.
How Many Records	At minimum, one per worker per month. If agency policy requires more frequent referral reading, local policy prevails.
What Part of Record	- Emergency response worker ONLY: » Referral assignment to close of referral. - Emergency response worker AND court/dependency worker: » Emergency response worker from referral assignment to hand off to court/dependency worker. » Court/dependency worker from assignment to close of referral.
Selecting Records	Randomly select one date per month per worker. On that date, the first risk assessment submitted for approval by that worker becomes the selected referral. Look for the risk assessment and all safety assessments for that referral.
Additional Case Reading	If the emergency response/dependency investigation worker is responsible for the case plan, also complete an initial case plan case reading tool.

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

Referral Name: _____ **Referral Number:** _____-_____-_____
Referral Date: _____/_____/_____ **Review Date:** _____/_____/_____
Worker Name: _____ **Reviewer Name:** _____
First Face-to-Face Contact: _____/_____/_____ **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*:

```



```

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:*

```



```

4. **Does the narrative support the worker's answers in the child vulnerabilities section?**
  ☐ Yes.
  ☐ No. *Provide details:*

```



```

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*:

```



```

*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:

[ ]

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*:

[ ]

☐ 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.

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*:

   ☐ Area of strength
   ☐ Area of opportunity
   ☐ Area of demonstrated growth
   Details:

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:

   ☐ Area of strength
   ☐ Area of opportunity
   ☐ Area of demonstrated growth
   Details:

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:*

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

11. **Was the final safety decision correct?**
- ☐ Yes.
- ☐ No. The final decision was incorrect. *Provide details*:

> (empty box)

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*:

> (empty box)

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

Details:

> (empty box)

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

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*:

2. **Were the risk assessment questions completed correctly based upon record narrative?***
   ☐ Yes.
   ☐ 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 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. 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® INVESTIGATION/ASSESSMENT AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE
SUPERVISORY REFERRAL CASE READING TOOL
DEFINITIONS

Safety Assessment
Unable to locate family. If family could not be located despite following agency procedures, mark this box and do not proceed with review. Select another referral for review.

1.   Was the tool completed according to policy?

Source: Dates of the first face-to face contact in CWS/CMS and assessment, alleged perpetrators, and the assessed household.

Answer YES if:
Initial safety assessment date is the same date as the first face-to-face contact where at least one child's safety was assessed, and the household where the maltreatment is alleged was assessed.

Answer NO if:

- Used incorrect format. A substitute care provider (SCP) safety assessment was used instead of a standard safety assessment, or vice versa.

- Completed too late. The date of the first safety assessment is not the same date as the date of the first face-to-face contact.

- Completed on wrong household. Allegations are related to one household, but the safety assessment appears to have been completed on another household. The most common mistake is that the allegations are related to a non-custodial household, but the safety assessment is completed for the custodial parent. Another common error occurs when allegations are related to a parent and the child is already staying with a relative; the safety assessment would be completed on the wrong household if it assesses safety in the home of the relative. (There may be a need to assess the safety of the placement home *in addition to* the parent home.)

- Safety plan lacks required signatures.

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

Source: Safety assessment and investigative narrative.

Answer YES if:
The date of the assessment corresponds to the date of the contact notes for the first face-to-face contact.

Answer NO if:
The date of the assessment does not correspond to the date of the contact notes for the first face-to-face contact.

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

Source: Safety assessment and investigative narrative.

Answer YES if:
Narrative corresponds to item marked.

- The item is marked "Yes," and there is evidence in the narrative supporting this answer.

- The item is marked "No," and there is evidence in the narrative supporting this answer.

- The item is marked "Parent Not Available," and there is evidence in the narrative supporting this answer.

- The item is marked "Parent Unsure," and there is evidence in the narrative supporting this answer.

Answer NO if:
Narrative does not correspond clearly to the item that is marked OR there is a discrepancy between the narrative content and the item marked. This category includes items marked that should not have been, as well as items that should have been marked that were not. This also could include verbal information provided by worker that was not reflected in the narrative AND was not scored; OR the tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that contradicts both narrative and item score.

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

Source: Safety assessment and investigative narrative.

Answer YES if:
Narrative corresponds with all marked/unmarked child vulnerabilities.

Answer NO if:
Narrative does not correspond clearly to each marked/unmarked child vulnerability item according to the definitions. This category includes items marked that should not have been, as well as items that should have been marked that were not. This also could include verbal information provided by worker that was not reflected in the narrative AND was not scored; OR the tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that contradicts both narrative and item score.

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

Source: Investigative narrative and, if applicable, the detention petition. Information also may be located in contact notes and the physical record (e.g., police reports). Ideally, workers learn to use investigative narrative and/or court reports to *summarize* all relevant information.

Answer YES if:
Narrative corresponds with all marked/unmarked safety threats.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:
Are the safety threats correlated with specific caregiver behaviors and the impact/potential impact on the child or children?

Answer NO if:
Narrative does not correspond clearly to each item marked/unmarked according to the definitions. Includes items marked that should not have been or items that should have been marked that were not. This also could include verbal information provided by worker that was not reflected in the narrative AND was not scored; OR the tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that contradicts both narrative and item score.

Briefly note which safety threat and caregiver complicating behavior items lack clear narrative.

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

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record (e.g., police reports).

Answer YES if:

- No caregiver complicating behaviors were identified within the narrative or marked on the safety assessment.

- Caregiver complicating behaviors are identified on the safety assessment, and the narrative supports those that were identified.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:
Are the complicating factors correlated with specific caregiver behaviors and the impact/potential impact on the child or children?

Answer NO if:

- Narrative provides information describing a caregiver complicating behavior, but no complicating behaviors were marked on the safety assessment.

- Narrative does not clearly correspond to each caregiver complicating behavior that is marked according to the definitions.

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

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record (e.g., police reports).

Answer YES if:
Narrative supports all identified household strengths and/or protective actions, as well as their appropriate use in safety planning.

For consideration while reviewing narrative and in providing worker feedback:

- Are the strengths and/or protective actions behaviorally specific?

- Does the narrative include the voice of the child?

- Does the narrative support the identification and/or involvement of at least one support network member?

Answer NO if:
Narrative does not correspond clearly to each household strength and/or protective action marked according to the definitions. This also could include verbal information provided by worker that was not reflected in the narrative AND was not scored; OR the tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

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

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record.

Answer YES if:
Narrative supports all identified household strengths and/or protective actions. Narrative provides specific details of immediate actions taken by caregiver and support network that will address and control identified safety threats. Record includes safety plan.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:
Do identified in-home interventions relate directly to present safety threats?

Answer NO if:
Narrative does not correspond clearly to each in-home protective intervention identified. This also could include verbal information provided by worker that was not reflected in the narrative AND was not scored; OR the tool and narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

9.   Was a safety plan completed appropriately?

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record.

Answer YES if:
The safety plan was completed appropriately, as evidenced by the following.

- The narrative and/or safety plan supports that the worker explained the process of safety planning to the family.

- The narrative and/or safety plan includes a specific behavioral description (danger statement) of the identified safety threat marked on the safety assessment.

- The narrative and/or safety plan contains evidence that at least one support network member besides the caregiver was included in the safety plan.

- The safety plan includes specific plan to monitor its effectiveness.

- The safety plan includes a time limit for review.

- The safety plan is signed by at least one legal caregiver, by the worker, and by the support network member.

In providing worker feedback, consider the presence of one or more examples listed above.

Answer NO if:

- The safety plan consists only of services.

- At least one support network member is *not* identified.

- Components of the safety plan are not behaviorally specific.

- Timeframes are not specific (e.g., "ongoing").

- The safety plan is not signed by at least one legal caregiver, by the worker, and by the support network member.

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

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record.

Answer N/A if:
The safety decision was either "Safe" or "Safe with plan"; therefore, a placement intervention was not needed.

Answer YES if:
Narrative corresponds with selected placement intervention.

Answer NO if:
Narrative does not correspond clearly to the identified in-home protective intervention. This also may include verbal information provided by worker that was not reflected in the narrative AND was not scored; OR the tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

11.   Was the final safety decision correct?

Source: Final recommendation compared to item scores and overrides.

Answer YES if:
All items were scored correctly, OR any differences in item scores would not have affected final recommendations.

Answer NO if:
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.

12.   Does the final recommendation match the action taken?

Source: Final safety decision, CWS/CMS, and safety plan document if decision was "Safe with plan."

Answer YES if:

- Decision was "Safe," and child remained home; OR

- Decision was "Safe with plan," child remained in the home, AND there is an appropriate safety plan; OR

- Decision was "Unsafe," and child was removed.

Answer NO if:

- Decision was "Safe" or "Safe with plan," but child was removed.

- Decision was "Unsafe," but child remained in the home.

- 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?

Source: Investigative narrative. CWS/CMS indicates child was later removed or returned home during investigation.

Answer YES if:

- There was a change in the presence/absence of safety factors or protective capacities, or there was a change in the ability of safety interventions to control safety threats; OR

- There was at least one safety threat, and the referral is being closed without promotion to a case.

Answer NO if:

- There were no substantial changes in safety threats, protective capacities, or interventions; AND

- Referral is either being promoted to a case or being closed, and the safety decision was "Safe."

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

Answer YES if:
At least one additional safety assessment was completed. *(Start a new case reading tool. Continue until all tools completed while the referral was open have been reviewed.)*

Answer NO if:
An additional safety assessment was not completed.

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

Source: Investigative narrative and contact notes.

Answer YES if:

- Worker accurately identified an additional household, and the household was appropriately assessed for safety. Narrative provides evidence that the additional household was identified accurately.

- Worker accurately identified no additional households; therefore, no additional safety assessments were needed. Narrative provides evidence that no additional households required assessment.

Answer NO if:
Another household was identified in the narrative; however, the worker did not complete an additional safety assessment. The narrative provides evidence that another household should have been assessed for safety; however, the worker did not identify this household or assess for safety.

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

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record.

Answer YES if:

- Narrative provides specific information regarding worker sharing safety assessment results with family.

- Narrative provides specific information regarding worker's efforts to share safety assessment results with family, whether or not the family was receptive to information.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:
Were the results shared using family-friendly and culturally sensitive language?

Answer NO if:

- Narrative does not include information regarding worker sharing safety assessment results with family.

- Narrative does not include information on worker's efforts to share safety assessment results with family.

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?

Source: Date of referral, date of assessment, date of closure for investigation, and participants. May also require review of investigation narrative.

Answer YES if:

- Completed on household where maltreatment was alleged; AND

- Completed after gathering sufficient information to adequately answer questions; AND

- Completed prior to closing referral, OR no later than 30 days after first face-to-face contact for protective placements.

Answer NO if:

- Completed too late. Investigation closing date comes before risk assessment date. NOTE: If child is protectively placed, risk assessment is completed too late if assessment date is more than 30 days after first face-to-face contact.

- Completed too soon. Assessment date is prior to the gathering of all information needed to complete the risk assessment.

- **Completed on wrong household**. Responses make it evident that worker assessed risk on a household other than where maltreatment was alleged. NOTE: If a child was removed, worker may be required to assess risk of a non-custodial parent's household. This assessment, however, should be completed within a *case* (not a referral) and should be clearly marked as applying to a non-removal household.

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

Source: Investigation narrative and/or detention petition. May require review of contact notes and other documents for case file.

<u>Answer YES if</u>:
All items marked are clearly supported by the narrative.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:

- Did the narrative include information regarding key items that contribute to higher risk that might be addressed in a case plan?

- Did the narrative provide specific observations made by the worker that support the assessment items selected?

- Did the narrative include evidence that worker elicited information from family members, children, and network members?

- Did the narrative include evidence that the worker used scaling questions, narrative-anchored questions, perspective questions, and/or solution-focused questions to elicit information?

<u>Answer NO if</u>:
One or more items, or an override, are marked in ways that are inconsistent with narrative.

- Narrative conflicts with marked item.

- Item is marked, but no narrative regarding item one way or another is included.

- Narrative includes discrepant information, and there is no description of why one point of view was reflected in item score while other point of view was not.

- Worker provided verbal information that was not reflected in narrative AND was not scored. The tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

Briefly describe which items and/or overrides were inconsistent.

3. Are overrides supported by narrative?

Source: Investigation narrative and/or detention petition. May require review of contact notes and other documents for case file.

<u>Answer YES if</u>:
Overrides marked are clearly supported by narrative.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:
Discretionary overrides should be based upon information not already considered elsewhere on the assessment; should be justified by observation of behaviors, characteristics, or conditions that are comparable in seriousness to other items on the assessment; AND should connect information to why children are more likely to experience harm in the future.

<u>Answer NO if</u>:

- Overrides are marked in ways that are inconsistent with narrative.

- Narrative conflicts with selected override.

- Item is marked, but there is no narrative regarding override one way or another.

- Narrative includes discrepant information, and there is no description of why one point of view was reflected in item score while other point of view was not.

- Worker provided verbal information that was not reflected in narrative AND was not scored. The tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

Briefly describe which overrides were inconsistent.

4. Is the final tool recommendation correct?

Source: Final recommendation compared to item scores and overrides.

<u>Answer YES if</u>:
All items were scored correctly, OR any differences in item scores would not have affected final recommendation.

<u>Answer NO if</u>:
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?

Source: Final risk level and CWS/CMS case opening decision.

Answer YES if:

- Risk was low or moderate, safety decision was "Safe," and no ongoing case was opened.

- Risk was high or very high; OR at least one safety threat remained, and a case was opened.

- Case opening decision did *not* match recommendation, BUT narrative provided a clear and supportable reason.

Answer NO if:

- Risk was low or moderate with no safety factors, but case was opened with no/inadequate explanation provided.

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

- 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?**

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record.

Answer YES if:

- Narrative provides specific information regarding worker sharing risk assessment results with family.

- Narrative provides specific information regarding worker's efforts to share risk assessment results with family, whether or not the family was receptive to information.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:
Did the worker explain the assessment process and results in a family-centered and culturally appropriate way?

Answer NO if:

- Narrative does not include information regarding worker sharing risk assessment results with family.

- Narrative does not include information on worker's efforts to share risk assessment results with family.

CALIFORNIA
SDM® VOLUNTARY/COURT INTAKE
SUPERVISORY CASE READING TOOL
POLICY AND PROCEDURES

For emergency response/dependency investigation supervisors

Who	Emergency response/assessment and investigations supervisors; dependency investigations/court supervisors
How Many Records	One per worker per month or according to county policy.
What Part of Record	FROM: Assignment of referral TO: Completion of case plan
Selecting Records	Randomly select a date for each worker. Starting on that date, the next FSNA submitted by the worker becomes the selected record. If worker does not submit an initial FSNA during the month, skip the month.

For family maintenance/family reunification supervisors

Who	Family maintenance/family reunification supervisors
How Many Records	One per worker every other month or according to county policy.
What Part of Record	FROM: Assignment of case TO: Completion of case plan
Selecting Records	Every other month, randomly select a date for each worker. (Select half of the workers in the unit each month.) Starting on that date, the next FSNA submitted by the worker becomes the selected record. If worker does not submit an initial FSNA during the month, skip the month.

CALIFORNIA
SDM® VOLUNTARY/COURT INTAKE
SUPERVISORY CASE READING TOOL

Referral Name: _____ **Referral Number:** _____-_____-_____
Referral Date: _____/_____/_____ **Review Date:** _____/_____/_____
Worker Name: _____ **Reviewer Name:** _____
Date of Face-to-Face for FSNA Contact: _____/_____/_____ **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*:

☐ 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*:

*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:*

```



```

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:

```



```

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

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

FAMILY STRENGTHS AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

1.   Was tool completed according to policy?

Source: Date of assessment, date of first face-to-face contact, date of case plan, participants, prioritization, and investigative narrative.

Answer YES if:

- The tool was completed no more than 30 days prior to case plan; AND

- Completed after gathering sufficient information; AND

- Completed on household where maltreatment was alleged; AND

- The worker assessed all applicable caregivers and children; AND

- The worker selected correct priority strengths and needs OR provided narrative to explain why other items were selected.

NOTE: Gathering sufficient information requires that family input was obtained and collateral sources were contacted as needed in making scoring decisions.

Answer NO if:

- Completed too late. The case plan date is prior to the FSNA date, AND/OR the assessment date is more than 30 days after the first face-to-face contact.

- Completed too soon. The FSNA was completed before the necessary information was gathered. Worker has up to 30 days after the first face-to-face contact. If the FSNA was completed sooner and worker clearly lacked information to adequately score it, this should be marked.

- Completed on wrong household. It is apparent that the assessed household is *not* the household where allegations were made. NOTE: If reunification services were offered to multiple households, there are additional FSNAs; however, only one FSNA should be completed within the referral, and it should assess the household on which allegations were made.

- Completed without interviewing or reasonable efforts made to interview the family. It is apparent that the case plan was developed without gathering information from the family, OR minimal effort was made to interview the family for the purpose of identifying priorities, strengths, and needs.

- Did not assess all caregivers. Household includes a secondary caregiver, but FSNA assessed primary caregiver only.

- Incorrect selection of primary/secondary caregivers. It is clear that the primary caregiver in the household was scored as the secondary caregiver and vice versa.

- Did not assess all children. One or more children who will have case plans were not assessed.

- Incorrect prioritization of needs. The priority needs were *not* the three lowest scores, AND no narrative explains why alternative needs were selected.

- Incorrect prioritization of strengths. The priority strengths are *not* the three highest scores, AND no narrative explains why alternative needs were selected.

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

Source: Item scores compared to contact notes, court report.

Answer YES if:
All items marked are clearly supported by narrative.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:

- Does narrative include evidence that the caseworker discussed cultural and household context with the child and the parent/caregiver, and their perspective on household context either supports or challenges safety?

- Does narrative indicate efforts to engage family members in assessing caregiver and child domains?

- Does narrative indicate evidence of the family's perspective and voice of the child?

- Does narrative indicate efforts to prioritize needs and strengths according to identified safety threats and risk factors affecting child safety?

- Does narrative indicate discussion/shared agreements with family regarding results?

Answer NO if:
One or more items were marked in ways that are inconsistent with narrative.

- Narrative conflicts with marked item.

- Item is marked, but no narrative regarding item one way or another is included.

- Narrative includes discrepant information, and no description is provided for why one point of view was reflected in item score while another point of view was not.

- Worker provided verbal information that was not reflected in narrative AND was not scored. The tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

Briefly describe which items and/or overrides were inconsistent.

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

Source: Final recommendation compared to item scores and overrides.

Answer YES if:
All items were scored correctly, OR any differences in item scores would not have affected final recommendation.

Answer NO if:
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.

4.   Does the assessment match the action taken?

Source: Priority needs for caregivers, needs for children, and case plan.

Answer YES if:

- Case plan addresses all priority need areas for caregivers and all child needs.
- Case plan builds on strengths.

Answer NO if:

- Case plan does not address priority needs for caregivers. One or more priority needs for caregivers is unaddressed, or is inadequately addressed, in the case plan.

- Case plan does not address all child needs. One or more child needs is unaddressed, or is inadequately addressed, in the case plan.

- Case plan incorporates objectives or services that are unrelated to priority needs for caregiver or child. The case plan includes objectives or services that do not relate to a caregiver or child need and are not otherwise required by policy.

- No evidence that strengths were considered. The case plan does not incorporate caregiver or child strengths.

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

Source: Priority needs for caregivers, needs for children, and case plan.

<u>Answer YES if</u>:

- Case plan includes behavioral objectives that describe the <u>presence</u> of actions and consistently demonstrated behaviors that contribute to safety.

- Case plan includes an overarching goal statement(s) that describes the <u>presence</u> of safety relevant to identified safety threats and risk.

In providing worker feedback, consider the presence of one or more examples listed above.

<u>Answer NO if</u>:

- Case plan objectives describe service participation.

- Case plan objectives describe the absence of a behavior.

- Case plan objectives are not relevant to safety threats or risk factors identified in SDM assessments.

CALIFORNIA
SDM® FAMILY MAINTENANCE REVIEW
SUPERVISORY CASE READING TOOL
POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Who	Family maintenance supervisors
How Many Records	One per worker per month or according to county policy.

What Part of Record	• First review:
	    » From case assignment to second case plan approval date; OR
	    » Case closing date.
	• Subsequent review:
	    » From LAST approved case plan to NEW approved case plan; OR
	    » Case closing date.

Selecting Records	Randomly select a date for each worker. Starting on that date, the next risk reassessment submitted for approval by that worker becomes the selected record.

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

Referral Name: _____ **Referral Number:** _____-_____-_____
Referral Date: _____/_____/_____ **Review Date:** _____/_____/_____
Worker Name: _____ **Reviewer Name:** _____
First Face-to-Face Contact: _____/_____/_____ **Referral Close Date:** _____/_____/_____

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:

   _____

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*:

   ```



   ```

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
   Provide 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.

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 marked items.
    ☐   No. Narrative includes information that an item should have been marked, but was not.
    ☐   No. *Provide details*:

    _____

    ☐   Area of strength
    ☐   Area of opportunity
    ☐   Area of demonstrated growth
    Details:

    _____

3. **Is the final assessment recommendation correct?**
☐ Yes. The final assessment recommendation is correct.
☐ No. *Provide details*:

[ ]

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:*

[ ]

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

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:

[ ]

SAFETY ASSESSMENT
☐ **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:*

[ ]

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:*

```



```

4.   Does the narrative support the worker's answers in the child vulnerabilities section?
   ☐   Yes.
   ☐   No. *Provide details:*

```



```

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:*

```



```

*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:

```



```

6. **Does the narrative support the 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 the narrative, as was their appropriate use in safety planning.

☐ 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.

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 caregiver.
   ☐ No. *Provide details:*

   ☐ Area of strength
   ☐ Area of opportunity
   ☐ Area of demonstrated growth
   Details:

9. **Was the safety plan completed appropriately?** (See item definition for needed elements.)
   ☐ N/A. Safety plan was not needed.
   ☐ No. Safety plan was created but does not include needed elements.
   ☐ Yes. Safety plan was created and includes needed elements.

   ☐ Area of strength
   ☐ Area of opportunity
   ☐ Area of demonstrated growth
   Details:

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 was "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:*

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

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 did 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 risk assessment results with the family?***
    ☐ 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.

CALIFORNIA
SDM® FAMILY MAINTENANCE REVIEW
SUPERVISORY CASE READING TOOL
DEFINITIONS

SERVICE PERIOD CASE NOTE REVIEW
Complete for each case reading for family maintenance review.

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

Source: Contact notes.

Answer YES if:
Contact notes provide information regarding the following.

- Worker oriented the parent/caregiver to the risk reassessment and each of its components in a family-oriented and culturally sensitive manner.

- Worker attempted to orient and explain the risk reassessment to the parent/caregiver in a family-oriented and culturally sensitive manner; however, the family was not receptive to attempts.

In providing worker feedback, consider the presence of one or more examples listed above.

Answer NO if:
Contact notes provide no information regarding worker's efforts to orient family to the risk reassessment, OR worker provided an orientation, but in a way that the family could not understand.

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

Source: Contact notes.

Answer YES if:
Contact notes provide information regarding the following.

- Changes in behavior related to case plan objectives.
- Changes in household during review period.

In providing worker feedback, consider the presence of one or more examples listed above.

Answer NO if:
Contact notes do not provide information related to the risk reassessment structure domains: original risk assessment scores, observations related to changes in the household that relate to risk, and/or changes in behavior that relate to case plan objectives.

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

Source: Contact notes.

Answer YES if:
Contact notes provide evidence of the worker using strategies that include the following.

- Asking questions regarding concerns, strengths, and potential impact if there are no changes in the situation.

- Development of a support network.

- Perspective of the child.

In providing worker feedback, consider the presence of one or more examples listed above.

Answer NO if:
Contact notes provide no evidence of worker using family engagement strategies.

RISK REASSESSMENT
Complete for each case reading for family maintenance review.

1.   Was the tool completed according to policy?

Source: Date of case opening, date of assessment, and participants.

Answer YES if:
Reassessment was completed within six months of case opening or most recent reassessment on correct household. The household is where the allegations from the originating referral occurred.

Answer NO if:

- Completed too late. More than six months elapsed from case opening or most recent reassessment to review date; OR substantial changes affecting risk occurred sooner, but risk reassessment was not done at the time changes were observed.

- Completed too soon. Completed more than 30 days prior to new case plan or case closure for voluntary cases, or more than 65 days prior to new case plan or case closure for court-ordered cases, with no apparent change in risk that would have prompted reassessment.

- Completed on wrong household. Household assessed is not the household where the allegations in the originating referral occurred.

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

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

Source: Item scores compared to contact notes, court report.

Answer YES if:
All items marked are clearly supported by narrative.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:

- Did the narrative provide specific observations made by the worker that support the assessment items selected?

- Did the narrative include evidence that worker elicited information from family members, children, and network members?

- Did the narrative include evidence that the worker used scaling questions, narrative-anchored questions, perspective questions, and/or solution-focused questions to elicit information?

Answer NO if:
One or more items, or an override, are marked in ways that are inconsistent with narrative:

- Narrative conflicts with marked item.

- Item is marked, but no narrative regarding item one way or another is included.

- Narrative includes discrepant information, and there is no description of why one point of view was reflected in item score while other point of view was not.

- Worker provided verbal information that was not reflected in narrative AND was not scored. The tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

Briefly describe which items and/or overrides were inconsistent.

3. Are overrides supported by narrative?

Source: Investigation narrative and/or detention petition. May require review of contact notes and other documents for case file.

Answer YES if:
Overrides marked are clearly supported by narrative.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:
Discretionary overrides should be based upon information not already considered elsewhere on the assessment; should be justified by observation of behaviors, characteristics, or conditions that are comparable in seriousness to other items on the assessment; AND should connect information to why children are more likely to experience harm in the future.

Answer NO if:

- Overrides are marked in ways that are inconsistent with narrative.

- Narrative conflicts with selected override.

- Item is marked, but there is no narrative regarding override one way or another.

- Narrative includes discrepant information, and there is no description of why one point of view was reflected in item score while other point of view was not.

- Worker provided verbal information that was not reflected in narrative AND was not scored. The tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

Briefly describe which overrides were inconsistent.

4.   Is the final tool recommendation correct?

Source: Final recommendation compared to item scores and overrides.

Answer YES if:
All items were scored correctly, OR any differences in item scores would not have affected final recommendation.

Answer NO if:
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?

Source: Final risk level and CWS/CMS indication for case closure or continued service.

Answer YES if:

- Risk was low or moderate, safety decision was "Safe," and case was closed.

- Risk was high or very high OR at least one safety threat remained, and a case remained open.

- Case closing decision did *not* match recommendation, BUT narrative provided a clear and supportable reason.

Answer NO if:

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

- Risk was low or moderate and there were safety factors, but case was closed and no/inadequate explanation was provided.

- 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?**

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record.

Answer YES if:

- Narrative provides specific information regarding worker sharing risk reassessment results with family.

- Narrative provides specific information regarding worker's efforts to share risk reassessment results with the family, whether or not the family was receptive to information.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:
Were the results shared using family-centered and culturally sensitive language?

Answer NO if:

- Narrative does not include information regarding worker sharing risk reassessment results with family.

- Narrative does not include information on worker's efforts to share risk reassessment results with family.

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

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes and physical record

Answer YES if:
Narrative provides specific information that the case action was to continue services and a new FSNA was needed to update a case plan.

Answer NO if:
Narrative provides specific information that the case action was to close OR a new FSNA was not needed to update a case plan.

If yes, was a new FSNA completed?

Source: Physical record

Answer YES if:
A new FSNA was completed and is located in the physical record. *Complete the FSNA portion of this tool.*

Answer NO if:
A new FSNA was needed to update the case plan AND there is no evidence in the physical record that one was completed.

8.   Was a case-closing safety assessment needed?

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes and physical record

Answer YES if:
Narrative provides specific information that the case action is to close. If this is the case action, a closing safety assessment must be completed.

Answer NO if:
Narrative provides specific information that the case action is to continue services and a closing safety assessment was not needed.

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

Source: Physical record

Answer YES if:
A closing safety assessment was completed and is located in the physical record. *Complete the safety assessment portion of this tool.*

Answer NO if:
A closing safety assessment was needed AND there is no evidence in the physical record that one was completed.

FAMILY STRENGTHS AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

1.   Was the tool completed according to policy?

Source: Date of assessment, date of first face-to-face contact, date of case plan, participants, prioritization, and investigative narrative.

Answer YES if:

- Completed no more than 30 days prior to case plan; AND

- Completed after gathering sufficient information; AND

- Completed on household where maltreatment was alleged; AND

- Assessed all applicable caregivers and children; AND

- Selected correct priority strengths and needs OR provided narrative to explain why other items were selected.

NOTE: Gathering sufficient information requires that family input was obtained, and collateral sources were contacted as needed in making scoring decisions.

<u>Answer NO if</u>:

- <u>Completed too late</u>. The case plan date is prior to the FSNA date, AND/OR the assessment date is more than 30 days after the first face-to-face contact.

- <u>Completed too soon</u>. The FSNA was completed before the necessary information was gathered. Worker has up to 30 days after the first face-to-face contact. If the FSNA was completed sooner, and worker clearly lacked information to adequately score, this should be marked.

- <u>Completed on wrong household</u>. It is apparent that assessed household is *not* the household where allegations were made. NOTE: If reunification services were offered to multiple households, there will be additional FSNAs; however, only one FSNA should be completed within the referral, and it should assess the household on which allegations were made.

- <u>Completed without interviewing or reasonable efforts made to interview family</u>. It is apparent that the case plan was developed without gathering information from the family, OR minimal effort was made to interview family for the purpose of identifying priorities, strengths, and needs.

- <u>Did not assess all caregivers</u>. Household includes a secondary caregiver, but FSNA assessed primary caregiver only.

- <u>Incorrect selection of primary/secondary caregivers</u>. It is clear that the primary caregiver in the household was scored as the secondary caregiver and vice versa.

- <u>Did not assess all children</u>. One or more children who will have case plans were not assessed.

- <u>Incorrect prioritization of needs</u>. The priority needs were *not* the three lowest scores, AND no narrative explains why alternative needs were selected.

- <u>Incorrect prioritization of strengths</u>. The priority strengths are *not* the three highest scores, AND no narrative explains why alternative needs were selected.

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

Source: Item scores compared to contact notes, court report.

Answer YES if:
All items marked are clearly supported by narrative.
For consideration in providing worker feedback:

- Does narrative include evidence that the caseworker discussed cultural and household context with the child and the parent/caregiver, and their perspective on household context either supports or challenges safety?

- Does narrative indicate efforts to engage family members in assessing caregiver and child domains?

- Does narrative indicate evidence of the family's perspective and voice of the child?

- Does narrative indicate efforts to prioritize needs and strengths according to identified safety threats and risk factors affecting child safety?

- Does narrative indicate discussion/shared agreements with family regarding results?

Answer NO if:
One or more items are marked in ways that are inconsistent with the narrative.

- Narrative conflicts with marked item.

- Item is marked, but no narrative regarding item one way or another is included.

- Narrative includes discrepant information, and no description is provided for why one point of view was reflected in item score while another point of view was not.

- Worker provided verbal information that was not reflected in narrative AND was not scored. The tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

Briefly describe which items and/or overrides were inconsistent.

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

Source: Final recommendation compared to item scores and overrides.

Answer YES if:
All items were scored correctly, OR any differences in item scores would not have affected final recommendation.

Answer NO if:
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.

4. Does the assessment recommendation match the action taken?

Source: Priority needs for caregivers, needs for children, and case plan.

Answer YES if:

- Case plan addresses all priority need areas for caregivers and all child needs.
- Case plan builds on strengths.

Answer NO if:

- <u>Case plan does not address priority needs for caregivers</u>. One or more priority needs for caregivers is unaddressed or inadequately addressed in the case plan.

- <u>Case plan does not address all child needs</u>. One or more child needs are unaddressed or inadequately addressed in the case plan.

- <u>Case plan incorporates objectives or services that are unrelated to priority needs for caregiver or child</u>. The case plan includes objectives or services that do not relate to a caregiver or child need and otherwise are not required by policy.

- <u>No evidence that strengths were considered</u>. The case plan does not incorporate caregiver or child strengths.

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

Source: Priority needs for caregivers, needs for children, and case plan.

Answer YES if:

- Case plan includes behavioral objectives that describe the <u>presence</u> of actions and consistently demonstrated behaviors that contribute to safety.

- Case plan includes an overarching goal statement(s) that describes the <u>presence</u> of safety relevant to identified safety threats and risk.

In providing worker feedback, consider the presence of one or more examples listed above.

Answer NO if:

- Case plan objectives describe service participation.

- Case plan objectives describe the absence of a behavior.

- Case plan objectives are not relevant to the safety threats or risk factors identified in SDM assessments.

SAFETY ASSESSMENT
Unable to locate family. If the family could not be located despite following agency procedures, mark this box and do not proceed with review. Select another referral for review.

1. Was the tool completed according to policy?

Source: Dates of the first face-to face contact in CWS/CMS and assessment, alleged perpetrators, and the assessed household.

Answer YES if:
Initial safety assessment date is the same date as the first face-to-face contact where at least one child's safety was assessed, and the household where the maltreatment is alleged was assessed.

Answer NO if:

- Used incorrect format. An SCP safety assessment was used instead of a standard safety assessment, or vice versa.

- Completed too late. The date of the first safety assessment is not the same date as the date of the first face-to-face contact.

- Completed on wrong household. Allegations are related to one household, but the safety assessment appears to have been completed on another household. The most common mistake is that the allegations are related to a non-custodial household, but the safety assessment was completed for the custodial parent. Another common error occurs when allegations are related to a parent and the child is already staying with a relative; the safety assessment would be completed on the wrong household if it assesses safety in the home of the relative. (There may be a need to assess the safety of the placement home *in addition to* the parent home.)

- Safety plan lacks required signatures.

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

Source: Safety assessment and investigative narrative

Answer YES if:
The date of the assessment corresponds to the date of contact notes for the first face-to-face contact.

Answer NO if:
The date on the assessment does not correspond to the date on the contact notes for the first face-to-face contact.

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

Source: Safety assessment and investigative narrative

Answer YES if:
Narrative corresponds to item marked.

- The item is marked "yes," and there is evidence in the narrative supporting this answer.

- The item is marked "no," and there is evidence in the narrative supporting this answer.

- The item is marked "Parent Not Available," and there is evidence in the narrative supporting this answer.

- The item is marked "Parent Unsure," and there is evidence in the narrative supporting this answer.

Answer NO if:
The narrative does not correspond clearly to the item that is marked OR there is a discrepancy in the narrative content and the item marked. This includes items that were marked and should not have been as well as items that should have been marked but were not. This could also include verbal information provided by the worker that was not reflected in the narrative AND was not scored; OR the tool and the narrative match, but the worker verbally reported information that contradicts both narrative and item score.

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

Source: Safety assessment and investigative narrative

Answer YES if:
Narrative corresponds with all marked/unmarked child vulnerabilities.

Answer NO if:
Narrative does not correspond clearly to each marked/unmarked child vulnerability item according to the definitions. Includes items marked that should not have been as well as items that should have been marked that were not. This also could include verbal information provided by worker that was not reflected in the narrative AND was not scored; OR the tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that contradicts both narrative and item score.

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

Source: Investigative narrative and, if applicable, the detention petition. Information also may be located in contact notes and the physical record (e.g., police reports). Ideally, workers learn to use investigative narrative and/or court reports to *summarize* all relevant information.

Answer YES if:
Narrative corresponds with all marked/unmarked safety threats.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:
Are the safety threats correlated with specific caregiver behaviors and their impact/potential impact on the child or children?

Answer NO if:
Narrative does not correspond clearly to each item marked/unmarked according to the definitions. Includes items marked that should not have been and/or items that should been marked that were not. This also could include verbal information provided by worker that was not reflected in the narrative AND was not scored; OR the tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that contradicts both narrative and item score.
Briefly note which safety threats and caregiver complicating behavior items lack clear narrative.

6.   Does the narrative support the identified complicating behaviors?

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record (e.g., police reports).

Answer YES if:

- No caregiver complicating behaviors were identified within the narrative or marked on the safety assessment.

- Caregiver complicating behaviors were identified on the safety assessment, and the narrative supports those that were identified.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:
Are the complicating factors correlated with specific caregiver behaviors and their impact/potential impact on the child or children?

Answer NO if:

- Narrative provides information describing a caregiver complicating behavior, but none were marked on the safety assessment.

- Narrative does not clearly correspond to each caregiver complicating behavior that is marked according to the definitions.

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

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record (e.g., police reports).

Answer YES if:
Narrative supports all identified household strengths and/or protective actions. Household strengths and protective actions were supported in the narrative, as was their appropriate use in safety planning.

For consideration while reviewing narrative and in providing worker feedback:

- Are the identified strengths and/or protective actions behaviorally specific?

- Does the narrative include the voice of the child?

- Does the narrative support the identification and/or involvement of at least one support network member?

Answer NO if:
Narrative does not correspond clearly to each household strength and/or protective action marked according to the definitions. This also could include verbal information provided by worker that was not reflected in the narrative AND was not scored; OR the tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

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

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record.

Answer YES if:
Narrative supports all identified household strengths and/or protective actions. Narrative provides specific details of immediate actions taken by the caregiver and/or the support network that will address and control identified safety threats. Record includes safety plan.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:
Do identified in-home interventions relate directly to present safety threats?

Answer NO if:
Narrative does not correspond clearly to each in-home protective intervention identified. This also could include verbal information provided by worker that was not reflected in the narrative AND was not scored; OR the tool and narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

9.   Was the safety plan completed appropriately?

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record.

Answer YES if:
Safety plan was completed appropriately, as evidenced by the following.
- Narrative and/or safety plan supports that the worker explained the process of safety planning to the family.

- Narrative and/or safety plan includes a specific behavioral description (danger statement) of the identified safety threat marked on the safety assessment.

- Narrative and/or safety plan contains evidence that at least one support network member besides the caregiver was included in the safety plan.

- The safety plan includes a specific plan to monitor its effectiveness.

- The safety plan includes a time limit for review.

- The safety plan is signed by at least one legal caregiver, the worker, and the support network member.

In providing worker feedback, consider the presence of one or more examples listed above.

<u>Answer NO if</u>:

- Safety plan consists only of services.

- At least one support network member is *not* identified.

- Components of the safety plan are not behaviorally specific.

- Timeframes are not specific (e.g., "ongoing").

- The safety plan was not signed by at least one legal caregiver, the worker, and the support network member.

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

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record.

<u>Answer N/A if</u>:
The safety decision was either "Safe" or "Safe with plan"; therefore, a placement intervention was not needed.

<u>Answer YES if</u>:
Narrative corresponds with selected placement intervention.

<u>Answer NO if</u>:
Narrative does not correspond clearly to the identified in-home protective intervention. This also may include verbal information provided by worker that was not reflected in the narrative AND was not scored; OR the tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

11. Was the final safety decision correct?

Source: Final recommendation compared to item scores and overrides.

<u>Answer YES if</u>:
All items were scored correctly, OR any differences in item scores would not have affected final recommendations.

Answer NO if:

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.

12. Does the final recommendation match the action taken?

Source: Final safety decision, CWS/CMS, and safety plan document if decision was "Safe with plan."

Answer YES if:

- Decision was "Safe," and child remained home; OR

- Decision was "Safe with plan," child remained in the home, AND there is an appropriate safety plan; OR

- Decision was "Unsafe," and child was removed.

Answer NO if:

- Decision was "Safe" or "Safe with plan," but child was removed.

- Decision was "Unsafe," but child remained in the home.

- Decision was "Safe with plan," and child remained in the home; but there was no safety plan, OR the safety plan did not adequately address all safety factors.

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

Source: Investigative narrative. CWS/CMS indicates child was later removed or returned home during investigation.

Answer YES if:

- There was a change in the presence/absence of safety factors or protective capacities, or there was a change in the ability of safety interventions to control safety threats; OR

- There was at least one safety threat, and the referral is being closed without promotion to a case.

Answer NO if:

- There were no substantial changes in safety threats, protective capacities, or interventions; AND

- The referral is either being promoted to a case or being closed, and the safety decision was "Safe."

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

Source: Investigative narrative. CWS/CMS indicates child was later removed or returned home during investigation.

Answer YES if:
At least one additional safety assessment was completed. *(Start a new case reading tool. Continue until all tools completed while the referral was opened have been reviewed.)*

Answer NO if:
An additional safety assessment was not completed.

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

Source: Investigative narrative and contact notes.

Answer YES if:

- Worker accurately identified an additional household, and the household was appropriately assessed for safety. Narrative provides evidence that the additional household was identified accurately.

- Worker accurately identified no additional households; therefore, no additional safety assessments were needed. Narrative provides evidence that no additional households required assessment.

Answer NO if:
Another household was identified in the narrative; however, the worker did not complete an additional safety assessment. The narrative provides evidence that another household should have been assessed for safety; however, the worker did not identify this household or assess it for safety.

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

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record.

Answer YES if:

- Narrative provides specific information regarding worker sharing safety assessment results with family.

- Narrative provides specific information regarding worker's efforts to share safety assessment results with family, whether or not the family was receptive to information.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:
Were the results shared using family-friendly and culturally sensitive language?

<u>Answer NO if</u>:

- Narrative does not include information regarding worker sharing safety assessment results with family.

- Narrative does not include information on worker's efforts to share safety assessment results with family.

CALIFORNIA
SDM® FAMILY REUNIFICATION REVIEW
SUPERVISORY CASE READING TOOL
POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Who	Family reunification supervisors
How Many Records	One per worker per month

What Part of Record	• First review:
	  » From case assignment to second case plan approval date; OR
	  » Case closing date.
	• Subsequent review:
	  » From LAST approved case plan to NEW approved case plan; OR
	  » Case closing date.

Selecting Records	Randomly select a date for each worker per month. Starting on that date, the next reunification reassessment submitted by the worker becomes the selected record.

CALIFORNIA
SDM® FAMILY REUNIFICATION REVIEW
SUPERVISORY CASE READING TOOL

Referral Name: _____   **Referral Number:** _____-_____-_____
Referral Date: _____/_____/_____   **Review Date:** _____/_____/_____
Worker Name: _____   **Reviewer Name:** _____
First Face-to-Face Contact: _____/_____/_____   **Referral Close Date:** _____/_____/_____

SERVICE PERIOD CASE NOTE REVIEW

1.   Does each case note show evidence that worker explained the method for reassessment?*
☐   Yes.
☐   No. *Provide details:*

[blank box]

☐   Area of strength
☐   Area of opportunity
☐   Area of demonstrated growth
Details:

[blank box]

2.   Does the case note show evidence of the reunification reassessment structure?*
☐   Yes.
☐   No. *Provide details:*

[blank box]

☐   Area of strength
☐   Area of opportunity
☐   Area of demonstrated growth
Details:

[blank box]

*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.

REUNIFICATION REASSESSMENT

1. **Was the tool completed according to policy?**
   ☐ Yes. Completed according to policy.
   ☐ No. *Provide details:*

2. **Were the reunification reassessment questions completed correctly based on record narrative?***
   ☐ Yes. All items marked are supported by narrative.
   ☐ No. Narrative does not support marked items.
   ☐ No. Narrative includes information indicating that an item should have been marked, but it was not.
   ☐ No. *Provide details:*

   ☐ Area of strength
   ☐ Area of opportunity
   ☐ Area of demonstrated growth
   Details:

3. Is the final tool recommendation correct?

☐ Yes. The final tool recommendation is correct.

☐ No. *Provide details:*

```



```

4. Does the tool recommendation match the action taken?

☐ Yes.

☐ No. *Provide details:*

```



```

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

5. Was there another household receiving reunification services?

☐ Yes.

☐ No. *Provide details:*

```



```

5a. If yes, was another reunification reassessment completed?

☐ Yes.

☐ No.

6. Is there evidence in the record that the worker discussed reunification 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.

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.

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

FSNA

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 marked items.
☐ No. Narrative includes information indicating that an item should have been marked, but it was not.
☐ No. *Provide details*:

☐ Area of strength
☐ Area of opportunity
☐ Area of demonstrated growth
Details:

3. **Is the final assessment recommendation correct?**
   ☐ Yes. The final assessment recommendation is correct.
   ☐ No. *Provide details*:

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:*

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

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:

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

CALIFORNIA
SDM® FAMILY REUNIFICATION REVIEW
SUPERVISORY CASE READING TOOL
DEFINITIONS

SERVICE PERIOD CASE NOTE REVIEW
Complete for each case reading for family reunification review.

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

Source: Contact notes.

Answer YES if:
Contact notes provide information regarding the following.

- Worker oriented parent/caregiver to the reunification reassessment and each of its components in a family-oriented and culturally sensitive manner.

- Worker attempted to orient and explain the reunification reassessment to the parent/caregiver in a family-oriented and culturally sensitive manner; however, the family was not receptive to attempts.

In providing worker feedback, consider the presence of one or more examples listed above.

Answer NO if:
Contact notes provide no information regarding worker's efforts to orient family to reunification reassessment, OR worker provided orientation to family in way that family could not understand. For example, the family is primarily Spanish-speaking and the worker provided an English copy of the assessment.

2.   Does the case note show evidence of the reunification reassessment structure?

Source: Contact notes.

Answer YES if:
Contact notes provide information regarding the following.

- Changes in behavior related to case plan objectives
- Frequency and quality of visitation
- Current safety in the household
- Permanency timeline

In providing worker feedback, consider the presence of one or more examples listed above.

Answer NO if:
Contact notes do not provide information related to the reunification reassessment structure domains: case plan objectives, frequency/quality of visitation, current safety in the household, and/or permanency timeline.

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

Source: Contact notes.

Answer YES if:
Contact notes provide evidence of worker using strategies that include the following.

- Mapping
- Development of a support network
- Perspective of the child
- Reference(s) to goal statements

In providing worker feedback, consider the presence of one or more examples listed above.

Answer NO if:
Contact notes provide no evidence of worker using family engagement strategies.

REUNIFICATION REASSESSMENT
Complete for each case reading for family maintenance review.

1.   Was the tool completed according to policy?

Source: Date of case opening or most recent review, date of assessment, participants, and most recent final risk level for a risk assessment tool (not risk reassessment).

Answer YES if:

- Reassessment was completed within six months of case opening on correct household; AND

- The assessed household was EITHER the household from which the children were removed OR the household of another legal parent/guardian receiving reunification services. (If two households received reunification services, there should be two reunification reassessments, and each should be reviewed separately.)

- The initial risk level is correct for this household, AND the correct decision tree was used.

Answer NO if:

- <u>Completed too late</u>. More than six months elapsed from case opening or most recent reassessment to review date; OR substantial changes affecting risk occurred sooner, but a risk reassessment was not done at the time changes were observed.

- <u>Completed too soon</u>. Completed more than 30 days prior to new case plan or case closure for voluntary, or more than 65 days prior to new case plan or case closure for court-ordered cases, with no apparent change in risk, visitation, or safety that would have prompted reassessment.

- <u>Completed on wrong household</u>. Household named in the header information is not household being assessed.

- <u>Used incorrect risk level for R1</u>. For the removal household with no new investigations since the case was opened, incorrect risk level would be anything other than the final risk level for the referral that opened the case. If the removal household had one or more new investigations since the case was opened, incorrect risk level would be anything other than the final risk level in the most recent referral.

NOTE: *For a non-removal household with no allegations, an incorrect risk level would be anything other than the final risk level for their initial risk assessment. If there were allegations on the non-removal household, an incorrect risk level would be anything other than the final risk level of the most recent risk assessment.*

- <u>Used incorrect decision tree</u>. Child was under age 3 at time of removal, but worker used tree for age 3 and over, or vice versa.

2. Were the reunification reassessment questions completed correctly based on record narrative?

Source: Item scores compared to contact notes, court report, the case plan that was in effect during review period, and visitation records.

Answer YES if:
All items marked are clearly supported by narrative.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:

- Is there evidence of specific observations made by worker that support assessment items selected?

- Is there evidence that worker elicited information from family members, children, and network members?

- Is there evidence that worker oriented family/caregiver to the reunification process during first interaction of service period?

- Is there evidence that worker explained the reassessment process and structure to family, including risk, behaviorally specific progress toward case plan goals, household safety, visitation frequency, and quality permanency planning?

- Is there evidence that the worker used scaling questions, narrative-anchored questions, perspective questions, and/or solution-focused questions to elicit information?

- Is there information regarding key items that contribute to higher risk that might be addressed in a case plan?

Answer NO if:
One or more items, or an override, are marked in ways that are inconsistent with narrative. Include risk, visitation, and safety.

- Narrative conflicts with marked item.

- Item is marked, but no narrative regarding item one way or another is included.

- Narrative includes discrepant information, and there is no description of why one point of view was reflected in item score while other point of view was not.

- Worker provided verbal information that was not reflected in narrative AND was not scored. The tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

Briefly describe which items and/or overrides were inconsistent.

3.   Is the final tool recommendation correct?

Source: Final recommendation compared to item scores and overrides.

Answer YES if:
All items were scored correctly, OR any differences in item scores would not have affected final recommendation.

Answer NO if:
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.

4.   Does the tool recommendation match the action taken?

Source: Final recommendation and CWS/CMS indication of whether child was returned home or remains in care AND whether permanency plan goal changed.

Answer YES if:
Recommendation of tool, after overrides, is the same as action recorded in CWS/CMS.

Answer NO if:

- Tool recommended reunification, but child was not reunified.
- Tool recommended continue FR, but child was reunified.
- Tool recommended continue FR, but FR was terminated.
- Tool recommended terminate FR, but FR was not terminated.

5.   Was there another household receiving reunification services?

Source: Case plan.

Answer YES if:
Reunification services were provided to an additional household during the review period.

Answer NO if:
No additional households received reunification services.

5a.   If yes, was another reunification reassessment completed?

Source: Case plan.

Answer YES if:
There is at least one reunification reassessment. *(Start a new case reading tool. Continue until all households receiving reunification services have been reviewed.)*

Answer NO if:
There is no additional reunification reassessment.

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

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record.

Answer YES if:

- Narrative provides specific information regarding worker sharing assessment results with family.

- Narrative provides specific information regarding worker's efforts to share assessment results with family, whether or not the family was receptive to information.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:

- Is there evidence of the worker explaining the assessment process and results in a family-centered and culturally appropriate way?

- Is there evidence that the worker structured the monthly case visit agenda around reunification, case plan objectives, visitation evaluation, and current safety in the home?

Answer NO if:

- Narrative does not include information regarding worker sharing assessment results with family.

- Narrative does not include information on worker's efforts to share assessment results with family.

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

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record.

Answer YES if:
Narrative provides specific information that the case action is to continue services and a new FSNA was needed to update a case plan.

Answer NO if:
Narrative provides specific information that the case action was to close OR a new FSNA was not needed to update a case plan.

If yes, was a new FSNA completed?

Source: Physical record.

Answer YES if:
A new FSNA was completed and is located in the physical record. *Complete the FSNA portion of this tool.*

Answer NO if:
A new FSNA was needed to update the case plan AND there is no evidence in the physical record that one was completed.

8.   Was a case-closing safety assessment needed?

Source: Investigative narrative, contact notes, and physical record.

Answer YES if:
Narrative provides specific information that the case action is to close. If this was the case action, the worker must have completed a closing safety assessment.

Answer NO if:
Narrative provides specific information that the case action is to continue services and a closing safety assessment was not needed.

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

Source: Physical record.

Answer YES if:
A case-closing safety assessment was completed and is located in the physical record. *Complete the safety assessment portion of this tool.*

Answer NO if:
A closing safety assessment was needed AND there is no evidence in the physical record that one was completed.

FSNA

1.   Was the tool completed according to policy?

Source: Date of assessment, date of first face-to-face contact, date of case plan, participants, prioritization, and investigative narrative.

Answer YES if:

- Completed no more than 30 days prior to case plan; AND

- Completed after gathering sufficient information; AND

- Completed on household where maltreatment was alleged; AND

- Assessed all applicable caregivers and children; AND

- Selected correct priority strengths and needs OR provided narrative to explain why other items were selected.

NOTE: Gathering sufficient information requires that family input was obtained, and collateral sources were contacted as needed in making scoring decisions.

Answer NO if:

- Completed too late. The case plan date is prior to the FSNA date, AND/OR the assessment date is more than 30 days after the first face-to-face contact.

- Completed too soon. The FSNA was completed before the necessary information was gathered. Worker has up to 30 days after the first face-to-face contact. If the FSNA was completed sooner, and worker clearly lacked information to adequately score, this should be marked.

- Completed on wrong household. It is apparent that assessed household is *not* the household where allegations were made. NOTE: If reunification services were offered to multiple households, there will be additional FSNAs; however, only one FSNA should be completed within the referral, and it should assess the household on which allegations were made.

- Completed without interviewing or reasonable efforts made to interview family. It is apparent that the case plan was developed without gathering information from the family, OR minimal effort was made to interview family for the purpose of identifying priorities, strengths, and needs.

- Did not assess all caregivers. Household includes a secondary caregiver, but FSNA assessed primary caregiver only.

- Incorrect selection of primary/secondary caregivers. It is clear that the primary caregiver in the household was scored as the secondary caregiver, and vice versa.

- Did not assess all children. One or more children who will have case plans were not assessed.

- Incorrect prioritization of needs. The priority needs were *not* the three lowest scores, AND no narrative explains why alternative needs were selected.

- Incorrect prioritization of strengths. The priority strengths are *not* the three highest scores, AND no narrative explains why alternative strengths were selected.

2.   Were the FSNA domains completed correctly based on record narrative?

Source: Item scores compared to contact notes, court report.

Answer YES if:
All items marked are clearly supported by narrative.

For consideration in providing worker feedback:

- Does narrative include evidence that the caseworker discussed cultural and household context with the child and the parent/caregiver, and their perspective on household context either supports or challenges safety?

- Does narrative indicate efforts to engage family members in assessing caregiver and child domains?

- Does narrative indicate evidence of the family's perspective and voice of the child?

- Does narrative indicate efforts to prioritize needs and strengths according to identified safety threats and risk factors affecting child safety?

- Does narrative indicate discussion/shared agreements with family regarding results?

Answer NO if:
One or more items are marked in ways that are inconsistent with narrative:

- Narrative conflicts with marked item.

- Item is marked, but no narrative regarding item one way or another is included.

- Narrative includes discrepant information, and no description is provided for why one point of view was reflected in item score while another point of view was not.

- Worker provided verbal information that was not reflected in narrative AND was not scored. The tool and the narrative match, but worker verbally reported information that is contradictory to both narrative and item score.

Briefly describe which items and/or overrides were inconsistent.

3.   Is the final tool recommendation correct?

Source: Final recommendation compared to item scores and overrides.

Answer YES if:
All items were scored correctly, OR any differences in item scores would not have affected final recommendation.

Answer NO if:
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.

4.   Does the tool recommendation match the action taken?

Source: Priority needs for caregivers, needs for children, case plan.

Answer YES if:

- Case plan addresses all priority need areas for caregivers and all child needs.
- Case plan builds on strengths.

Answer NO if:

- Case plan does not address priority needs for caregivers. One or more priority needs for caregivers is unaddressed or inadequately addressed in the case plan.

- Case plan does not address all child needs. One or more child needs are unaddressed or inadequately addressed in the case plan.

- Case plan incorporates objectives or services that are unrelated to priority needs for caregiver or child. The case plan includes objectives or services that do not relate to a caregiver or child need and otherwise are not required by policy.

- **No evidence that strengths were considered**. The case plan does not incorporate caregiver or child strengths.

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

Source: Priority needs for caregivers, needs for children, and case plan.

Answer YES if:

- Case plan includes behavioral objectives that describe the <u>presence</u> of actions and consistently demonstrated behaviors that contribute to safety.

- Case plan includes an overarching goal statement(s) that describes the <u>presence</u> of safety relevant to identified safety threats and risk.

In providing worker feedback, consider the presence of one or more examples listed above.

Answer NO if:

- Case plan objectives describe service participation.

- Case plan objectives describe the absence of a behavior.

- Case plan objectives are not relevant to safety threats or risk factors identified in the SDM assessments.