

**CALIFORNIA
SAFETY-ORGANIZED PRACTICE/STRUCTURED DECISION MAKING® SYSTEM
SAFETY PLANNING CQI TOOL**

Case Name: _____ **Referral #:** _____

Worker: _____ **Supervisor:** _____

Review Date: _____ **Reviewer:** _____

Methodology: Review the Structured Decision Making® (SDM) Safety Assessment, the immediate safety plan, and applicable case notes and documents, and assess their alignment with California safety planning guidelines and best-practice standards.

Goal: This continuous quality improvement (CQI) tool allows supervisors to review and provide balanced feedback on areas of accomplishment and areas for development within safety planning practice. CQI tools may be used to support live consultation and strengthening of safety plans while in the field, or to review established plans to identify opportunities to increase safety for families and improve agencywide safety planning practice. Practice trends observed across units can provide critical information related to agency needs and infrastructure, and they should be used not only to strengthen individual worker practice but also to support planning for targeted system improvements.

A. SDM® SAFETY ASSESSMENT REVIEW

Date of First Contact: _____ **Date of Assessment:** _____

Assessment Type: Initial Review/update Referral/case closing

Household Name: _____

Were There Allegations in This Household? Yes No

Identified Safety Threats:

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Physical harm/threat | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Hazardous living conditions | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Questionable explanation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Sexual abuse | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Child is danger to self/others | <input type="checkbox"/> 8. Refuses access/may flee |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Immediate needs not met | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Failure to protect | <input type="checkbox"/> 9. Previous maltreatment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 10. Other: _____ | | |

Safety Decision:

- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Safe | <input type="radio"/> Safe with plan | <input type="radio"/> Unsafe |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Intervention by worker | <input type="checkbox"/> 10. Voluntary placement |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Use of community members | <input type="checkbox"/> 11. Protective custody |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Use of community agencies | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Use of tribal resources | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Have the caregiver appropriately protect | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Have the alleged perpetrator leave the home | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Move to a safe environment | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 8. Legal action | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 9. Other (specify): _____ | |

B. IMMEDIATE SAFETY PLAN REVIEW

Date of Plan: _____ Planned Review Date: _____

Instructions: Review the following areas related to the immediate safety plan and assess achievement in each practice area.

Area	Achieved?	Comments
Immediate Safety Plan Document		
The plan identifies the specific SDM® safety threats present.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
The plan includes a simple statement of the specific caregiver actions or inactions causing concern for impact on the child now and in the future.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
The plan includes at least one member from the safety and support network.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
Action steps support an immediate change in the care environment and are sufficient to immediately protect against the danger.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
Action steps are clear and specific, including who, what, and when.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
Plan language avoids jargon such as “domestic violence” or “inadequate supervision” and provides behavior specific details.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
The plan is time-limited and indicates a <i>maximum</i> of 30 days before review.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
A clear plan for monitoring includes how the safety plan will be reviewed and what should happen if it is not working.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
The plan includes signatures of at least one legal caregiver, one person from the network, and an agency representative.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
Immediate Safety Plan Development		
The process and urgency of safety planning were explained clearly to the family to support active participation and network development.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Insf	
Action steps were co-created with the caregiver.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Insf	
The plan was explained clearly to all involved members, including the child and the alleged perpetrator when appropriate.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Insf	
With the social work supervisor’s support, the plan was strengthened or approved while in the field.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	

Area	Achieved?	Comments
Safety Plan Monitoring and Review		
The worker engaged with the family and network to review the plan, including how it is monitored and its time limit.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Insf	
A facilitated meeting, such as a Child and Family Team Meeting or Team Decision Making, was used during the service period to develop, strengthen, or review the plan.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
If a child was removed during the investigation, reasonable efforts to develop, revise, or strengthen the plan to prevent removal were exhausted.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> N/A	

Areas of Accomplishment	Areas of Development	Next Steps

C. SOCIAL WORKER PRACTICES

Quality of Harm and Danger Statements

Is a harm statement documented in the investigation narrative or safety plan? Yes No
 Is a danger statement documented in the investigation narrative or safety plan? Yes No

Consider the following when completing the scale.

- Links to SDM safety threats selected
- Written in family-friendly language (i.e., no jargon)
- Behavior specific
- Clearly states impact to child
- Evidence that statements were shared with family and network

Scale for Worker/Yourself					
Emerging*		Acquired†		Accomplished‡	
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> 6
Comments:					

* Rarely or inconsistently demonstrates the practice behaviors, or requires significant supervisor direction/support to use them.

† Often demonstrates the practice behaviors, with some or minimal direction from supervisor.

‡ Consistently demonstrates the practice behaviors as standard practice in virtually all referral/case circumstances, using independent critical thinking skills.

Use of Core Practice Model Skills and Solution-Focused Questions

Consider the following when completing the scale.

- Uses solution-focused questions to support assessment and planning process
- Orients family to the purpose and process of safety planning
- Identifies and engages family members and others who are important to the child/family to build a network that can be engaged in safety planning
- Shares harm and danger statements with family and network members

Scale for Worker/Yourself					
Emerging*		Acquired†		Accomplished‡	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Comments:					

* Rarely or inconsistently demonstrates the practice behaviors, or requires significant supervisor direction/support to use them.

† Often demonstrates the practice behaviors, with some or minimal direction from supervisor.

‡ Consistently demonstrates the practice behaviors as standard practice in virtually all referral/case circumstances, using independent critical thinking skills.

Strategies to Support Practice Developments: