



Rapid Safety Feedback Case Review Instrument

In-home Service Cases

Case Management Services

This document contains the case review items, core concepts, instructions and considerations, and rating criterion which critical child safety teams will use to assess open investigations of children under four years of age meeting the criteria described on page 3.

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Item 1: Family Assessments	5
1.1 Is the most recent family assessment sufficient?	
1.2 Is the most recent family assessment completed timely?	
Item 2: Case Manager Visits	7
2.1 Is the quality of visits between the case manager and the child(ren) sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?	
2.2 Is the frequency of visits between the case manager and the child(ren) sufficient to ensure child safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?	
2.3 Is the quality of visits between the case manager and the child’s mother sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?	
2.4 Is the frequency of the visits between the case manager and the child’s mother sufficient to ensure child safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?	
2.5 Is the quality of the visits between the case manager and the child’s father sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?	
2.6 Is the frequency of the visits between the case manager and the child’s father sufficient to ensure child safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?	
Item 3: Background Checks and Home Assessments	9
3.1 Are background checks and home assessments completed when needed?	
3.2 Is the information assessed and used to address potential danger threats?	
Item 4: Safety Management	11
4.1 Is the safety plan sufficient?	
4.2 Is the safety plan actively monitored to ensure that it is working effectively to protect the child(ren) from identified danger threats?	
Item 5: Supervisory Case Consultation and Guidance	13
5.1 Is the supervisor regularly consulting with the case manager?	
5.2 Is the supervisor ensuring recommended actions are followed up on?	

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Introduction

The single most critical function of child welfare case managers is the complex process of assessing families related to child safety at every stage. The community-based care (CBC) QA reviewer's role is to assess case work practice and conduct a case consultation with the case manager and supervisor when safety concerns are present. Consultations must be scheduled and conducted with a sense of urgency to address practice issues regarding child safety.

Each CBC will review ten (10) in-home service cases each quarter using the Rapid Safety Feedback Tool.

The sample will be selected using the business objects report entitled "Children Receiving In-Home-Services Daily QA Listing." The report includes all children in an active living arrangement as of the report date. The report provides a list of children under the age of four for whom either a caretaker in the living arrangement has been an alleged perpetrator for allegations of BOTH Family Violence Threatens Child AND Substance Misuse. The allegations could be in a single or separate investigation. Modifying these Input Controls will either further restrict or expand the listing of children displayed.

1. The report is set to default to parent or caregiver under age 27 but the reviewer has discretion to increase or decrease the age.
2. At least one prior report was received on the victim child or other victim child under the age of 5 (0 to 4 years and 364 days); and
3. In order to obtain the minimum number of cases, the sample criteria may need to be further stratified as follows:
 - (a) 1st: All children under 12 months of age regardless of the maltreatment.
 - (b) 2nd: Children under age 4 with an open investigation at the time sample selection, regardless of maltreatment.
 - (c) 3rd: Children under age 4 where the caretaker has been an alleged perpetrator for family violence threatens harm and substance misuse.
 - (d) 4th: Children under age 4 where the caretaker has been an alleged perpetrator for family violence threatens harm or substance misuse.
4. Cases must be open at least 30 days.
5. If the CBC is unable to meet the sample size, the values in the report described below should be expanded to "all" and the age of the child should be expanded beginning with age 4.
6. The case must be open at the time of the review.
7. Prioritize cases with an open investigation.

Refer to Windows into Practice for additional information

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

*Item 1***Family Assessments**

- 1.0 Are recent family assessments of danger threats, child vulnerability, and family protective capacities sufficient to identify safety concerns and case plan actions needed to effectively address caregiver protective capacities and child needs?
- 1.1 Is the most recent family assessment sufficient?
- 1.2 Is the most recent family assessment completed timely?

Response Rating: Strength Area Needing Improvement

Core Concepts: The family assessment is an ongoing process that provides the case manager with information that informs the case manager's actions throughout the case. The family assessment is documented on a regular basis in FSFN as the agency's official position to the current status of impending danger threats, child well-being and safety analysis. For CBCs that have transitioned to the child welfare safety practice model, the family assessment is the Family Functioning Assessment (FFA) Ongoing and Progress Update. A family assessment includes:

1. Understanding the family dynamics and conditions must change to achieve lasting child safety and permanency.
2. Identifying changes in family dynamics that inform the need for changes in safety management.
3. Gathering continuous feedback from the family and others as to what is working or not working to support the family change process.
4. An understanding of the parent(s) internal motivation to change and its progression over time.
5. Creating and evaluating case plan outcomes and associated actions to effectively address caregiver protective capacities and child needs.

The completion of the Progress Update occurs when the criteria have been applied to all outcomes in the case plan. These assessments help determine the sufficiency of the current safety plan and progress toward case plan goals and outcomes. Assessments should be conducted in partnership with the family to help the parent(s) or legal custodian(s) recognize and remedy conditions, so children can safely remain in their own home.

In the practice model, the ongoing assessment process is known as the FFA-ongoing. The FFA-Ongoing is initially pre-populated in FSFN with information developed by the investigator related to the maltreatment. The case manager must develop a new description, based on further information collected and assessed to provide a basis for the scaling of caregiver protective capacities and child strengths and needs and the identification of case plan outcomes.

Instructions: The reviewer rating of item 1.1 will require professional judgement as to the sufficiency of the most recent family assessments. The reviewer should consider if recent family assessments contained sufficient information to identify and seek agreement regarding what must change related to child safety and to develop case plans to effectively address parent(s) or legal custodian(s) protective capacities and meet the child needs.

The reviewer rating for item 1.2, timeliness, requires the reviewer to determine if the ongoing assessments were completed within 30 days of case transfer to services for the FFA ongoing, or there was justification for

the delay in the assessment. Additionally, if the case has progressed past the FFA ongoing, the reviewer will determine if the most recent Progress Update was completed within the 90-day time frame.

Rating Criterion:

1.1 Are recent family assessments sufficient?

- Strength, if the reviewer believes the most recent ongoing assessment sufficiently documents and identifies concerns and case plan actions needed to effectively address caregiver protective capacities and child needs.
- No, if the reviewer does not believe the recent ongoing assessment was sufficient.

1.2 Are family assessments timely?

- Strength, if the most recent ongoing assessment was completed within required timeframes. (Initial approved by supervisor within 30 days of case transfer staffing, ongoing at least every 90 days and at critical junctures)
- Area Needing Improvement, if the most recent ongoing assessment and progress updates were not completed within required timeframes.

Reference: Sections 39.01(18), 39.01(31), 39.01, (59), F.S.; Florida Administrative Code 65C-30.005 (1-3), CF Operating Procedure 170-9, Family Assessment and Case Planning.

*Item 2***Case Manager Visits**

- 2.0 Are visits between case managers, children, and parent(s) or legal custodian(s) sufficient to ensure child safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?
- 2.1 Is the quality of visits between the case manager and the child(ren) sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?
- 2.2 Is the frequency of visits between the case manager and the child(ren) sufficient to ensure child safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?
- 2.3 Is the quality of visits between the case manager and the child's mother sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?
- 2.4 Is the frequency of the visits between the case manager and the child's mother sufficient to ensure child safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?
- 2.5 Is the quality of the visits between the case manager and the child's father sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?
- 2.6 Is the frequency of the visits between the case manager and the child's father sufficient to ensure child safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?

Response Rating: Strength Area Needing Improvement

Core Concepts: Case manager visits are an integral part of assessing and ensuring child safety. Visits provide an opportunity to meet with children to monitor children's safety; assess the ongoing service needs of children and parent(s) or legal custodian(s); monitor progress toward established case plan outcomes; evaluate the continued appropriateness of safety interventions; observe child interactions with siblings, significant caregivers, and other household members; and assess child functioning and child vulnerability.

Case manager visits and interactions with the parents and child provide an opportunity to build a constructive working relationship with parent(s). A constructive working relationship is also critical to the case manager's ability to co-construct meaningful case plan outcomes, strategies for change and to assess parent progress over time. Quality is assessed on the visits that occurred. Qualitative visits are:

- Planned in advance of the visit, with issues noted for exploration and goals established for the time spent together.
- Individualized. For example, visits should include separate time for discussions with children and parents/caregivers. This provides the opportunity to privately share their experiences and concerns and to ensure that issues that might not be disclosed when other family/household members are present are identified and addressed.
- Focused on the case plan and the completion of actions necessary to support achieving the case plan outcomes.
- Exploratory in nature, examining changes in the child's circumstances on an ongoing basis.
- Well documented so that the agency can follow up on commitments and decisions made during the visit.
- Assessing for safety during interactions with all case participants, including children, caregivers, parents, and service providers to ensure child safety. Individual and family circumstances change frequently enough to warrant continual monitoring and updating when new safety threats are

identified; parental protective capacities diminish; new members join the family or leave the home; or there is an increase in stressors in general, e.g., loss of job, illness, pregnancy, etc.

Instructions: This item looks at the quality and frequency of visits. The reviewer must consider the frequency necessary to ensure the child's safety. Face-to-face contacts should occur more frequently than every thirty days when the child's situation dictates or as determined in consultation with the case manager's supervisor based on a review of the case and assessed safety or as determined by the court. A "visit" is defined as a face-to-face contact between the case manager and the child and parent or legal custodian.

Questions to consider when assessing the quality and frequency of visits:

1. Are visits of sufficient duration to address key issues with the child, or was it just a brief visit?
2. Did the case manager see the child alone or was the parent(s) or legal custodian(s) usually present during visits with the child?
3. What were the topics discussed during the visits?
4. What was the pattern of visits? (unannounced/announced; same time, in home, etc.)
5. What was the frequency of visit?

Rating Criterion:

Items 2.1-2.6 will be rated based on the following guidance when assessing case manager visits with the mother, father, and child(ren).

- Strength, if the reviewer believes the quality of the case manager visits are sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes.
- Strength, if the reviewer believes the frequency of the case manager visits are sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes.
- Area Needing Improvement, if the reviewer believes the quality of the case manager visits are not sufficient.
- Area Needing Improvement, if the reviewer believes the frequency of the case manager visits are not sufficient.
- Not applicable, if one of the parents is not a party to the case, or the mother or father cannot be located and there are documented efforts to locate them, or no visits occurred.

Reference: Florida Administrative Code 65C-30.007 (1) (a-b); (2) (a-d); (3) (a-b), 4 (a), (5) (a-b), & (7),

*Item 3***Background Checks and Home Assessments**

3.0 Are background checks and home assessments sufficient and responded to with a sense of urgency when needed to address potential danger threats?

3.1 Are background checks and home assessments completed when needed?

3.2 Is the information assessed and used to address potential danger threats?

Response Rating: Strength Area Needing Improvement

Core Concepts: The case must contain an assessment of implications for child safety based on background check results for all household members and others with significant caregiving responsibility. The case manager must demonstrate an understanding of the importance of background screening and how the information may link to new danger threats. The case manager must confirm and assess for the following:

- a. Children in household – Names, dates of birth, current placement, role in case plan (yes/no).
- b. Parent/Legal Custodians and other household members – Names, dates of birth, relationship to child, role in FFA.
- c. Other significant persons in the family’s life and role in case plan.
- d. Safety service providers
- e. As required in the Other Parent Assessment

Definitions: The following definitions define the household, household members and others with significant caregiver responsibility:

1. “Household” means a common residence shared by two or more individuals whether related or not. (Rule 65C-30.001 Definitions, F.A.C., 05-21-14)
2. “Household Member” means any person who resides in a household, including the parent(s) or legal custodian(s) and other family members residing in the home. Household members are any additional relatives or persons residing in the home, including but not limited to visitors expected to stay an indefinite length of time or college students expected to return to the home. (Rule 65C-30.001 Definitions, F.A.C., 05-21-14)
3. “Significant Caregiver Responsibility” means that the specific adult household members have taken on a role for major caregiving responsibilities. Things to consider in determining whether another adult household member has “significant responsibility” include but are not limited to the following:
 - a. Pervasive, day to day care and responsibility for protecting the child such that the child views such caregiver(s) as one of the primary persons with the authority for their care and the caregiver is expected to remain a part of the family unit **OR**;
 - b. The other household member or paramour residing in or frequenting the home has become a parent figure based on the:
 - child welfare professional observations of interactions between child and paramour or household member;
 - child’s statements about the household member or paramour;

- statements from other family members or friends who are familiar with family functioning;
- the child has a bond with the household member or paramour, even though the household member or paramour may or may not provide any financial support to the family.

Instructions: The case manager must ensure that Progress Updates and/or Judicial Reviews include an update of household composition to identify any new persons in the household, a new paramour as well as any new persons involved with the care of the child. The reviewer should review the investigation FFA, case management FFA ongoing, family history, progress updates and information from interviews with the paramour and household members as part of the assessment process. The review must determine how effectively the background information was used to assess and address potential danger threats. The reviewer must also determine if the case manager demonstrates an understanding of the background screening information and is alert to new household members and the requirements of the Other Parent Assessment.

Rating Criterion:

3.1 Are background checks completed when needed?

- Yes – The reviewer believes background and home assessment were completed when needed.
- Area Needing Improvement – reviewer does not believe background checks and home assessments were completed when needed.

3.2 Is the information evaluated and used to address potential danger threats?

- Strength – The reviewer believes the case manager evaluated the information and used the information to address potential danger threats.
- Area Needing Improvement – The reviewer does not believe the case manager evaluated the information and used it to address potential danger threats.

A Request for Action is mandatory if a significant caregiver has not been background screened.

References: s. 39.0138; F.S.; s. 322.142(4), F.S. Rule 65C-29.009, F.A.C., CF Operating Procedure 170-7, Safety Planning; CF Operating Procedure 170-9, Family Assessment and Case Planning, CF Operating Procedure 170-1, Chapter 6, Requesting and Analyzing Background Records

Item 4

Safety Management

4.0 Is a sufficient safety plan in place to control danger threats to protect a child?

4.1 Is the safety plan sufficient?

4.2 Is the safety plan actively monitored to ensure that it is working effectively to protect the child(ren) from identified danger threats?

Response Rating: Strength Area Needing Improvement Not Applicable

Core Concepts: A safety plan is established to control and manage danger threats to a child when a parent is unavailable, unable or unwilling to protect their child. A safety plan is established for all in-home service cases in response to present or impending danger that meets threshold requirements in CFOP 170-1, Chapter 2, paragraph 2-2, Present Danger, and paragraph 2-3, Impending Danger. A safety plan will be based upon a specific parent/legal guardian's behavior, emotion, or condition that results in a child being unsafe using the least intrusive means appropriate. A safety plan will be in effect as long as a case remains open and parent(s)/legal guardians do not have sufficient protective capacity to protect the child from out of control conditions in the home that would otherwise qualify as danger threats.

Safety management is the active monitoring of a safety plan to ensure that it is working effectively to protect the child(ren) from identified danger threats. Safety management activities are non-negotiable regardless of the type of safety plan. The primary worker responsible for the case will continuously monitor and assess the family's condition and dynamics to ensure a comprehensive and complete understanding of family dynamics that will inform on-going safety planning and plan modification. Safety management includes the timely modification of any plan when more intrusive, or less intrusive, actions are possible due to changes in family dynamics or conditions.

The need for modifications to the safety plan may be triggered by a specific event, but individual and family circumstances change frequently enough to warrant continual monitoring and updating when new safety threats are identified; parental protective capacities diminish; new members join the family or leave the home; or there is an increase in stressors in general, e.g., loss of job, illness, pregnancy, etc. The safety plan should also be updated when things are improving with the family. The case manager assessment could result in an update to the progress evaluation that may require a modification of the safety plan.

A safety plan is sufficient when:

1. It controls or manages the danger threat at the right level of intrusiveness (not too much or too little).
2. Has an immediate effect.
3. Safety services are immediately accessible and available to do what is expected to control the threat.
4. Contains safety actions to control the danger threat and must achieve this action fully each time it is delivered.
5. Is not promissory in nature (i.e., parent promises not to hit their child, parent or legal custodian promises not to let a paramour back in the home, parent or legal custodian promises to stop drinking).

Instructions: The reviewer must determine if the agency developed a sufficient safety plan with the family and safety services and treatment providers. Recurring maltreatment and recurring safety concerns must be thoroughly reviewed within the context of determining the sufficiency of the Safety Plan to control the identified danger threats.

The reviewer must also determine if sufficient monitoring took place as documented in progress updates. Sufficient monitoring will include case manager observations; feedback from safety service providers; and ongoing communication with those individuals who can provide additional insight as to behavioral change and protective capacities of the parent or legal custodians, documenting appropriate interactions with children, assessing occurrences of DV incidents, etc.

Rating Criterion

4.1 Is the safety plan sufficient?

- Strength, if the reviewer believes the safety plan meets the definition of sufficiency as defined in the core concepts.
- No, if the safety plan does not meet the definition of sufficiency as defined in the core concepts. **If no, a Request for Action is mandatory.**
- NA, if there is not a need for a safety plan due to the conditions of the case and the case reviewer agrees that a safety plan is not needed. Example, child is deemed safe, but the court will not release from court ordered supervision.

4.2 Is the safety plan actively monitored to ensure that it is working effectively to protect the child(ren) from identified danger threats?

- Strength, if the reviewer believes the safety plan is being effectively monitored.
- Area Needing Improvement, if the reviewer determines the safety plan is not being effectively monitored. **If no, a Request for Action is mandatory.**
- NA, if there is not a need for a safety plan due to the conditions of the case and the reviewer agrees that a safety plan is not needed.

Reference: Sections 39.01(67) and 39.301(9)(b), F.S.; CF Operating Procedure 170-7, Safety Planning

*Item 5***Supervisory Case Consultation and Guidance**

5.0 Is the case manager supervisor conducting guided discussions at specific points in the case management process focused on promoting effective practice and decision making?

5.1 Is the supervisor regularly consulting with the case manager?

5.2 Is the supervisor ensuring recommended actions are completed?

Response Rating: Strength Area Needing Improvement Not Applicable

Core Concepts: Supervisor consultations are guided discussions at specific points in the case management process that apply the child welfare practice model criteria focused on promoting effective practice and decision making. Effective supervisor consultations provide modeling of strength-based interviewing, encouraging case manager input and ideas; and offering feedback. Case consultations provide the supervisor with venues to learn about the quality of practice of the case managers assigned to them. This includes understanding the interpersonal skills that their case managers use to engage families, knowing how to build effective family teams, critically thinking and assessing family dynamics throughout the life of a case, and ultimately which case managers need additional support and professional development.

Instructions: The reviewer must determine if the supervisor is providing sufficient oversight and guidance to the case manager. Supervisor consultation is required for the approval of FFAOs; safety plans; and case plans and progress assessment. Supervisor consultation should be provided more frequently based on the case manager's request for assistance or when the supervisor has identified that more support with a complex case is needed regarding progress and/or challenges in achieving case plan outcomes. The reviewer must refer to CF Operating Procedure 170-9, Chapter 10, Supervisory Consultation and Approval Requirements as needed. This item is rated on the reviewer's professional judgment on the sufficiency of the Supervisory Consultations to provide guidance and feedback to the case manager, not necessarily compliance with CFOP.

Rating Criterion:

5.1 Is the supervisor regularly consulting with the case manager?

- Strength, if the reviewer believes the case manager provided field support (by phone or in person), through direct observations of cases management interviews, consultations in the office, active modeling and/or coaching.
- Area Needing Improvement, if the reviewer does not believe the supervisor provided regular consultations and field support.

5.2 Is the supervisor ensuring recommended actions are completed?

- Strength, if the reviewer believes supervisor is ensuring recommended actions are completed.
- Area Needing Improvement, if the reviewer does not believe the supervisor is following up on recommended actions.

References: CF Operating Procedure 170-9, Family Assessment and Case Planning, Chapter 10.