Ongoing Safety Model QA Case Review

General instructions: When the reviewer notes a discrepancy between their judgment and the worker's judgment of whether the child is safe or unsafe, the reviewer must alert the QA Supervisor immediately and the PSA will be alerted immediately.

Reviewer will check intake history when reviewing ongoing assessments.

General Information	
Review Date	
Reviewer	
Service Area	
Local Office	
Supervisor	
Worker	
Master Case Number	
Permanency Objective	
END date and /or last date month in which Safety Assessment was completed	
Period Under Review for visitation frequency and quality	(include month & year)

Reviewer General Comments:

Response/Contact Information

1. **Was the safety assessment conducted in relationship to:**

☐ New CAN report received on case
☐ Review
☐ At transfer for ongoing case issues
☐ Visitation planning
☐ Planning for reunification with family
☐ Change in case circumstances
☐ Case Closure

Only Complete #2-8 for NEW CAN Report Received on an Ongoing Case

	Y	N	NA
2. Was the initial contact with all child victims made within the required time frame?	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
Time frames: Reviewers should determine whether the initial contact was initiated within the timeframe specified in the State's policy for a report of that particular type or priority.
Priority 1 reports require face-to-face contact with the alleged victim by a Protection and Safety worker or law enforcement within 24 hours of the date the initial intake was received.
Priority 2 reports require face-to-face contact with the alleged victim within 0-5 calendar days from the date the initial intake was received.
Priority 3 reports require face-to-face contact with the alleged victim in 0-10 calendar days from the date the initial intake was received.
NA is warranted for instances when the child is deceased.

3. Were all other children in the household interviewed?	Y	N	NA
	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
Other children are defined as any child living in the household of the alleged child victim, even if they are not related to the child victim.
Non-verbal children require observation.
NA is warranted when no children other than the victims were in the household.

3a. If one or more of the children in the household could not be interviewed, is there an explanation in the report that reasonably justifies the lack of contact?	Y	N	NA
	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
Reasonably justified includes the following situations: parent refused, child completely unavailable, child deceased, child out of country.
Reviewers must note the explanation.
NA is warranted when all children were interviewed.

4. Was the non-maltreating caregiver(s) interviewed?	Y	N	NA
	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
Please answer based on adult caregivers.
NA is warranted when no non-maltreating caregiver exists.

5. Were other adults in the home interviewed?	Y	N	NA
	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
Adult refers to individuals age 18 years and older.
NA is warranted when no other adults resided in the home.

6. Was the maltreating caregiver(s) interviewed?	Y	N	NA
	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
The worker must interview all adult caregivers.
The reviewer should note any caregiver the worker did not interview.

7. Was the interview protocol followed? ***(If Yes, skip to 9.)***	Y	N	NA
	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
Answer yes if the worker interviewed all members according to the interview protocol.
The worker will interview each member of the family in the following order:

1. The alleged child victim(s)
2. Siblings and other children in the home
3. Non-maltreating parent/caretaker
4. Other adults in the home
5. The alleged perpetrator.

8. If the interview protocol was not followed, did documentation indicate the reason for the deviation from the protocol?	Y ☐	N ☐	NA ☐

9. During the period under review, was the frequency of the visits between Children and Family Services Specialist and all child(ren) sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety of the child and/or permanency and/or well-being of the child?	Y ☐	N ☐

Typical Pattern of Visitation;

- ☐ **More then once a week**
- ☐ **Once a week**
- ☐ **Less than once a week, but at least twice a month**
- ☐ **Less than twice a month, but at least once a month**
- ☐ **Less than once a month**
- ☐ **Never**

Comments regarding visitation;

MONTH	Child 1	Child 2	Child 3	Child 4
	-	-	-	-

Instructions:
Review period is defined as six months prior to the end date of current safety assessment under review or initial safety assessment to end date of updated safety assessment. In some instances, review period may not be six months.

Nebraska policy requires that Children and Family Services Specialist will have an in-person, face to face visit at least once per month with the child(ren) that are state wards, placed under the auspices of the Interstate Compact on Placement of Children or Interstate Compact on Juveniles in non-facility placements and all children in a voluntary (non-court involved) CPS case.

9a. During the period under review, was the quality of the visits between Children and Family Services Specialist and child(ren) sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety of the child and/or permanency and/or well-being of the child? Comments regarding quality of visitation;	Y ☐	N ☐

Instructions:
Reviewers should consider length, location of the visit and if Children and Family Services Specialist contact with the child was private face to face contact.

Reviewers should consider topics; evidence of issues pertaining to child's safety and permanency or well-being were addressed during the visit.

Review period is defined as six months prior to the end date of current safety assessment under review or initial safety assessment to end date of updated safety assessment. In some instances, review period for the Safety Assessment may not be six months.

	Y	N	NA
10. During the period under review, was the frequency of the visits between Children and Family Services Specialist and mother sufficient to address issues pertaining to ensure the safety of the child and/or permanency and/or well-being of the child? ***(If NA, skip to 11.)***	☐	☐	☐

Typical Pattern of Visitation;

☐ **More then once a week**

☐ **Once a week**

☐ **Less than once a week, but at least twice a month**

☐ **Less than twice a month, but at least once a month**

☐ **Less than once a month**

☐ **Never**

Comments regarding visitation;

MONTH	MOTHER
	-

Instructions:
Review period is defined as six months prior to the end date of current safety assessment under review or initial safety assessment to end date of updated safety assessment. In some instances, review period may not be six months.

NA is warranted when the permanency objective is not Family Preservation or Reunification.

NA is warranted when the mother is deceased or parent is incarcerated and in solitary confinement.

NA is warranted when agency contact with non-maltreating parent was determined to be contrary to child's safety or best interests, location of the mother is unknown and there is documentation of agency's concerted efforts to locate parent, parental rights were terminated before the period under review, parent was not involved in the child's life in any way despite agency efforts to involve her.

Nebraska policy requires that Children and Family Services Specialist will have an in-person, face to face contact at least once per month with the parent of a ward when permanency objective is reunification.

	Y	N
10a. During the period under review, was the quality of the visits between Children and Family Services Specialist and mother sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety of the child and/or permanency and/or well-being of the child? **Comments regarding quality of visitation;**	☐	☐

Instructions:
Reviewers should consider both the length of the visit and location of the visit.

Reviewers should consider whether the visits between Children and Family Services Specialist and mother focused on issues pertinent to case planning, service delivery and goal achievement as it relates to identified safety threats and enhanced/diminished parent capacities.

Review period is defined as six months prior to the end date of current safety assessment under review or initial safety assessment to end date of updated safety assessment. In some instances, review period may not be six months.

NA is warranted if question #10 was NA.

	Y	N	NA
11. During the period under review, was the frequency of the visits between Children and Family Services Specialist and father sufficient to address issues pertaining to ensure the safety of the child and/or permanency and/or well-being of the child? ***(If NA, skip to 12.)***	☐	☐	☐

Typical Pattern of Visitation;

☐ **More then once a week**

☐ **Once a week**

☐ **Less than once a week, but at least twice a month**

☐ **Less than twice a month, but at least once a month**

☐ **Less than once a month**

☐ **Never**

Comments regarding visitation;

MONTH	FATHER -

Instructions:
Review period is defined as six months prior to the end date of current safety assessment under review or initial safety assessment to end date of updated safety assessment. In some instances, review period may not be six months.

NA is warranted when the permanency objective is not Family Preservation or Reunification.

NA is warranted when the father is deceased or parent is incarcerated and in solitary confinement.

NA is warranted when agency contact with father was determined to be contrary to child's safety or best interests, location of the father is unknown and there is documentation of agency's concerted efforts to locate parent, parental rights were terminated before the period under review, parent was not involved in the child's life in any way despite agency efforts to involve him.

Nebraska policy requires that Children and Family Services Specialist will have an in-person, face to face contact at least once per month with the parent of a ward when permanency objective is reunification.

	Y	N
11a. During the period under review, was the quality of the visits between Children and Family Services Specialist and <u>father</u> sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety of the child and/or permanency and/or well-being of the child? **Comments regarding quality of visitation;**	☐	☐

Instructions:
Reviewers should consider both the length of the visit and location of the visit.

Reviewers should consider whether the visits between Children and Family Services Specialist and father focused on issues pertinent to case planning, service delivery and goal achievement as it relates to identified safety threats and enhanced/diminished parent capacities.

Review period is defined as six months prior to the end date of current safety assessment under review or initial safety assessment to end date of updated safety assessment. In some instances, review period may not be six months.

NA is warranted if question #11 was NA.

	Y	N	NA
12. During the period under review, were other adults in the home interviewed/assessed and incorporated into the safety assessment?	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
Adult refers to individuals age 18 years and older.

Review period is defined as six months prior to the end date of current safety assessment under review or initial safety assessment to end date of updated safety assessment.

NA is warranted when no other adults resided in the home.

<u>Present Danger/Protective Action</u> (Reviewers will only consider finalized Immediate Protective Action Plans)

	Y	N
13. Did the worker identify present danger during contacts with the child and/or family?	☐	☐

	Y	N
14. Does the reviewer agree with the worker's assessment of present danger during contacts?	☐	☐

Instructions:
Present Danger: Immediate, significant and clearly observable severe harm or threat of severe harm, occurring to a child/ youth in the present.

Protective Action: An immediate, short term response to control present danger observed at first contact with a family, or at any time present danger is identified to manage the immediate threats to the child.

	Y	N	NA
15. If present danger was identified was an Immediate Protective Action taken? ***(If No or N/A, skip to 21.)***	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
NA is warranted when present danger was not identified.

	Y	N	NA
16. Does the documentation indicate that the reasons for the Protective Action was explained to the parent/caregiver?	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
The reviewer should look for the family signature on the protective action form.

NA is warranted when no present danger exists.

	Y	N	NA
17. Was the Protective Action document signed by the protective caregiver?	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
The protective caregiver includes anyone coming in to be part of the protective action.
NA – Answer is NA – QA staff is not reviewing hard copy files at this time.
NA is warranted when no present danger exists.

	Y	N	NA
18. Did the Protective Action include a provision for oversight? ***(If Yes, continue to 18a. If No or NA continue to 19.)***	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
NA is warranted when no present danger exists.

	Y	N	NA
***18a.* Was the oversight requirement sufficient to assure that the Protective Action was implemented in accordance with expectation and was assuring child safety?**	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
Sufficient refers to a plan for oversight that is carefully followed. The plan must meet the following criteria:

1. The plan involves a responsible person being in direct face-to-face contact with the family and child.
2. Oversight should include time and effort by the responsible person consistent with what is known about the present danger.
3. Oversight must occur at least weekly.

19. Did the protective action contain the following?	Y	N	NA
☐ **Parent's willingness to cooperate.**	☐	☐	☐
☐ **Description of person(s) responsible for the protective action.**			
☐ **Confirmation of person responsible for protective action: trustworthiness, reliability, commitment, availability, and alliance to plan.**			
☐ **Description of protective action: how it will work.**			
☐ **Time frames (frequency and anticipated duration) of protective action.**			

Instructions:
The reviewer must check all that were documented. To answer yes, all of the above criteria must be checked. NA is warranted when no present danger exists.

20. Reviewer's judgment of the Protective Action:
Sufficient/appropriate ☐
Insufficient/inappropriate ☐
N/A ☐

Instructions:
Sufficient and appropriate are based on a Protective Action involving all of the following: justified by present danger; least intrusive; involves caregivers in so far as possible; has immediate impact; employs verified suitable providers; short-term (to end of initial assessment). Protective action addressed safety threats. Least restrictive, other options noted.

6 Domains, Safety Evaluation, Impending Danger (Reviewer will only consider finalized Safety Assessments)

	Y	N	N/A
21. Was sufficient information collected regarding the extent of maltreatment?	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
Sufficient refers to summary of the allegations, identified maltreatment; details about symptoms, events, circumstances and severity related to the current report of maltreatment; identification of the person responsible for the maltreatment; the location and condition of the reported child/youth and if there is a pattern of maltreatment.

If an YLS evaluation determines that there are possible safety issues, worker is to complete a full safety assessment.

N/A is warranted when the worker indicates and the reviewer determines there is no new information related to maltreatment.

	Y	N	N/A
22. Was sufficient information collected regarding the nature of maltreatment?	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
Sufficient refers to circumstances and events associated with maltreatment; includes duration; progress or patterns; response of non-maltreating caregiver; explanation for maltreatment; attitudes of caregivers regarding maltreatment; indicates what children were involved, includes analysis of previous maltreatment and major influences that led to the maltreatment.

If an YLS evaluation determines that there are possible safety issues, worker is to complete a full safety assessment.

N/A is warranted when the worker indicates and the reviewer determines there is no new information related to maltreatment.

	Y	N
23. Was sufficient information collected regarding current child functioning?	☐	☐

Instructions:
Sufficient refers to physical, emotional and social development; predominant behavior; peer and school behavior; mood and temperament; speech and communication; vulnerability; general behavior; daily routines and habits; ability to self-protect.
Worker may include summaries from all providers such as therapist, family support worker, foster home, etc.

24. Was sufficient information collected regarding current parenting disciplinary practices?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

Instructions:
Sufficient refers to intent, attitudes and expectations about discipline; purposes for discipline; creativity and versatility; age appropriateness; varied methods.
Worker may include information from service providers regarding parent (s) progress.

25. Was sufficient information collected regarding current general parenting?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

Instructions:
Sufficient refers to parenting style and approach; knowledge of child development and parenting' parenting skill; parenting satisfaction; sensitivity to child's limits; realistic expectations. Does not include information about discipline.
Worker may include information from service providers regarding parent (s) progress.

26. Was sufficient information collected regarding current adult functioning?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

Instructions:
Sufficient refers to general behavior; daily routine and habits' communication; emotional control and presentation; social relationships; problem solving; stress management; mental health, substance use, domestic violence, marital/partner relationships, available supports, use of resources.
Worker may include information from service providers regarding parent (s) progress.

27. Was there indication that information should have been collected from a collateral source? ***(If Yes, continue to 27. If No, skip to 28.) May include: foster care providers, therapists, informal supports, etc.***	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐
27a. Was the collateral information collected and incorporated into the assessment?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

28. Did the worker identify maternal relatives?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐
29. Did the worker identify paternal relatives?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐
30. Was information obtained regarding ICWA?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

31. Reviewer's qualitative judgment regarding the quality and adequacy of information:		
a. Was the information sufficient to provide a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐
b. Was the information sufficient to support and justify decision making?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

Instructions:
For safety assessment decisions the information must:
Identify and justify the presence of safety threats
Justify the type of safety plan

32. Was documentation sufficient in the six domains to accurately assess the 14 safety factors?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

33. Does the reviewer agree with the worker on all the safety factors that were identified "yes"?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐	**NA** ☐

Instructions:
The reviewer will look for whether the information provided met the definition of the safety factor and whether it met the threshold criteria.

NA is warranted when no safety factors were identified as yes.

34. Does the reviewer agree with the worker on all the safety factors that were identified "no"?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

Instructions:
No is warranted when the reviewer does not have sufficient documentation to determine the appropriateness of the workers response.

35. At the end of the safety assessment, did the worker identify impending danger?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

Instructions:
The reviewer should consider whether safety factors were identified as safety threats.

36. Does the reviewer agree with the worker's assessment of impending danger?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

Instructions:
Impending Danger: Threats to child/youth safety that may not be occurring in the present, but are likely to occur in the immediate to near future. These threats may or may not be identified at the onset of CFS intervention, but are often understood upon a more full evaluation and understanding of individual and family conditions and functioning. This understanding results in a reasonable and prudent conclusion that without CFS safety intervention, severe harm is probable in the near future.
The reviewer should answer no if not enough information was documented to make a determination.

37. Within safety factors identified as "yes", did the documentation contain justification for the identification of impending danger?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐	**NA** ☐

Instructions:
Justification must meet criteria for impending danger; family conditions, behavior, motives, intent, attitudes, perceptions, beliefs, situations that are 1) out of control; 2) likely to cause, result in, contribute to a severe effect in a child; 3) imminent with respect to certainty to happen and likely to have a severe effect within a limited period of time; 4) occurring in the presence of a vulnerable child; and 5) observable and specific

Severe effects are consistent with harm that can result in significant pain; serious injury; disablement; grave or debilitating physical health or physical conditions; acute or grievous suffering; terror; impairment; death.

Out-of-control refers to family conditions, which can affect a child and are unrestrained; unmanaged; without limits or monitoring; not subject to influence, manipulation or internal power; are out of the family's control.

A vulnerable child is one that is dependent on others for protection.

NA is warranted if the worker did not identify any safety factors as a yes.

Safety Plan (Reviewer will only consider finalized Safety Plans)

	Y	N	NA
38. Did the protective action remain in effect up to the change in case status/circumstances? ***(NA if there was not an immediate Protective Action.)***	☐	☐	☐

	Y	N	NA
39. Was a safety plan completed in accordance with changes in case circumstances? **Instructions:** Safety Plan is continually re-evaluated by the worker to ensure the plan continues to sufficiently address identified safety threats to the child or to adjust the safety plan as necessary. Examples of when a safety plan should adjust; parental protective capacities have been enhanced, reunification, placement changes, modifications in visitation plan, level of service intervention, etc. Reviewers will utilize the most current finalized Safety Plans. If Reviewer determines the Safety Plan has not been adjusted to reflect current case circumstances, Reviewer will answer No. ***(N/A if the assessment was completed in relation to case closure and reviewer agrees that the safety plan was appropriately adjusted to reflect current case circumstances. If N/A, skip to 56.*** ***Reviewer will mark No if the safety plan has not been adjusted to reflect current case circumstances. If No, skip to 56.)***	☐	☐	☐

	Y	N
40. Was an in-home safety plan utilized?	☐	☐

	Y	N	NA
41. If an in–home safety plan was not utilized, should the worker have utilized one? ***(NA if an in home safety plan was completed.)***	☐	☐	☐

	Y	N
42. Was a combination safety plan utilized?	☐	☐

Instructions:
A combination safety plan uses a combination of in-home and out-of-home actions.

	Y	N	NA
43. If a combination safety plan was not utilized, should the worker have utilized one? ***(NA if a combination safety plan was completed.)***	☐	☐	☐

	Y	N
44. Was an out-of-home safety plan utilized?	☐	☐

	Y	N	NA
45. If an out-of –home safety plan was not utilized, should the worker have utilized one? ***(NA if an out of home safety plan was completed.)***	☐	☐	☐

	Y	N
46. Did the safety plan contain a contingency plan?	☐	☐

	Y	N
47. Did the reviewer judge the contingency plan to be appropriate? ***(If there is not a contingency plan listed check "N" for no.)***	☐	☐

	Y	N
48. Was the suitability of safety plan participants completed? ***(Instructions: An assessment of Safety Plan participants must be completed to receive a Yes.)***	☐	☐

	Y	N
49. Did the reviewer judge that there was sufficient information to support the decision of the suitability of the safety plan participants? ***(If the worker did not complete the suitability of all safety plan participants the answer is "N" for no.)***	☐	☐

50. Does the safety plan appropriately address:	Y	N
Yes ☐ No ☐ **Who can make sure the child is protected?**	☐	☐
Yes ☐ No ☐ **What action is needed?**		
Yes ☐ No ☐ **Where will the plan and action take place?**		
Yes ☐ No ☐ **When is this action going to be finished?**		
Yes ☐ No ☐ **How is it all going to work—how are the actions going to control the safety threats?**		

Instructions:
The reviewer should check all that apply.
In order to answer yes on the overall question the reviewer must check all items.

	Y	N
51. Did the safety plan contain caregiver promissory commitments?	☐	☐

Instructions:
Promissory commitments refer to the caregiver having responsibility to manage safety when it has been determined that the situation is out of their control.

	Y	N
52. Did the safety plan involve in-home services?	☐	☐

	Y	N
53. Does the safety plan run continuously as long as safety threats are present?	☐	☐

	Y	N	NA
54. Did the safety plan include a provision for oversight? ***(If Yes, continue to 54a. If No or NA, skip to 55.)***	☐	☐	☐

	Y	N	NA
54a. Was the oversight requirement sufficient to assure that the safety plan was implemented in accordance with expectation and was assuring child safety?	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
CFSS is responsible for oversight of the Safety Plan. Safety Plans will be monitored continuously, but no less often than once a week prior to completion of the assessment. Monitoring of the Safety Plan will involve face to face contact with the child and family and phone calls to Safety Plan participants. This monitoring may be done by the PSW, or other person designated by the PSW to provide monitoring. An individual Safety Plan participant cannot be designated to monitor the Safety Plan. As progress is demonstrated toward achieving the identified outcomes, the Safety Plan may be monitored less frequently, but no less than once a month. All monitoring activities will be documented and maintained in the case record. If monitoring is done by someone other than the PSW, the PSW will review the monitoring reports at least once a week.

55. Is the safety plan adjusted as threats increase or decrease?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

Protective Capacity Assessment (Reviewers will only consider finalized Protective Capacity Assessments)

56. Was a Protective Capacity Assessment Conducted? ***(If Yes, continue to 57. If No, skip to 59.)***	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

57. Does documentation reflect that a consensus was reached between the worker and the family about what has changed or needs to change?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

58. Did the worker identify enhanced Protective Capacities?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

Conditions for Return (Reviewers will only consider finalized Conditions for Return)

59. Was/Were the Child(ren) in OUT OF HOME CARE at the end of the current safety assessment? **** Notes: If No Skip to question #62.*** ***If Yes, answer question 60 & 61, skip question 62 & 63 and move on to Overall analysis questions.***	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

Instructions:
** End of current safety assessment refers to end date of current safety assessment.*

60. Were conditions of return established for children who were in Out of Home Care at the end of the current safety assessment? **** Note if No or N/A skip to Overall Analysis Questions.***	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐	**NA** ☐

Instructions:
NA is warranted if:
1. *Child(ren) was/were not in out of home care at the end of the current safety assessment.*
2. *At the end of the current safety assessment, the Child(ren) has/have been in out of home care less than 30 days since the 1st day of their placement in out of home care.*

61. Do conditions for return include how an in home safety plan would work to keep the child safe and what specific behaviors must be present in the home to ensure and sustain safety? **Note: After answering question 61 – skip the next two questions and move on to overall analysis questions.**	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐	**NA** ☐

Instructions:

Reviewers should assess the information to determine if they include well defined circumstances within a child's/youth's home that mitigate against the ***identified threats*** *to child/youth safety. Keeping in mind that Impending Danger threats do not have to be completely eliminated in order for the child to be reunified with his/her family but the conditions of the home must be stabilized so that it has become possible to return the child home with an In-Home Safety Plan.*

NA is warranted if:
1. *Child(ren) was/were not in out of home care during the period under review.*
2. *Child(ren) has/have been in out of home care less than 30 days since the 1st day of their placement*

in out of home care.

3. *Conditions of Return were not established (previous question was answered No)*

62. CHILDREN <u>LIVING AT HOME</u> AT THE END OF THE CURRENT ASSESSMENT: Were the child(ren) in OUT OF HOME care for a period longer than 30 days at any time between the * IA and the current Ongoing Safety Assessment? **** Note: If No skip to overall analysis questions.*** ***If Yes, answer question #63, then move on to the overall analysis questions***	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐	**NA** ☐

Instructions:

**IA – refers to the Initial Assessment in which the child(ren) was/were determined to be unsafe and ongoing services began.*

NA is warranted if:

1. *Child(ren) were NOT living at home at the end of the current assessment.*

Note: Conditions of Return are completed for any situation in which the child is expected to be out of the parental home for 30 days or longer, but may be developed for placement of shorter duration if the CFS Specialist and the family agree.

63. Were conditions of return found on N-FOCUS for children who were in out of home care for a period longer than 30 days at any time between the * IA and the current Ongoing Safety Assessment?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐	**NA** ☐

Instructions:

NA is warranted if:

2. *Child(ren) was/were NEVER removed from the family home.*
3. *Child(ren) was/were in out of home placement* ***less than 30 days.***

Note: Conditions of Return are completed for any situation in which the child is expected to be out of the parental home for 30 days or longer, but may be developed for placement of shorter duration if the CFS Specialist and the family agree.

The Reviewers overall analysis and conclusion of the work

This part of the review contains most of what is included in the Supervisory Review of the Nebraska Safety Assessment. For the purpose of a case review, the reviewer would assess the following information based on their review of the case. Once that was completed the reviewer would then look at the supervisor's response to the following question and review if they matched or did not match what the reviewer had. If there were discrepancies between the supervisor response and the reviewer response, there should be a protocol established on how to resolve the issue and ensure that appropriate action is taken.

For ALL cases:

1.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	The Nebraska Safety Assessment Instrument was completed correctly and completely.
2.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	Documentation is on N-FOCUS.
3.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	Required time frames for monthly caseworker visits with the child and family were met.
4.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	A reasonable level of effort was expended given the identified safety concerns. (Supervisory review; consider #1, #3, #6 when answering. Also consider information contained in domains of safety assessment and quality of contacts with child(ren), parent (s) and/or collaterals)
5.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	Safety of the child/youth was assured during the assessment process. (Supervisory review; consider #1, #3, #6, #10 & #11 when answering. Also consider information contained in domains of safety assessment and quality of contacts with child(ren), parent (s) and/or collaterals)
6.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	Sufficient information was gathered for informed decision making, based on written documentation.
7.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	Available written documentation was obtained from law enforcement, medical providers, school personnel and others as appropriate.
8.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	ICWA information was documented. (Refer to #30 within review tool)
9.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	Information was obtained about non-custodial parent, relatives, and other family supports. (Refer to #28 & 29 within review tool)
10.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	An immediate Protective Action was appropriately implemented to assure child safety.

11.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	A Safety Plan was appropriately completed and implemented to assure child safety.
12.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	The Safety Assessment was documented in accordance with required practice. (Supervisory Review; If #1 is No, please answer no)
13.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	A Protective Action was documented in accordance with required practice. (Supervisory Review; If #10 is No please answer no)
14.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	A Safety Plan was documented in accordance with required practice. (Supervisory Review; If #11 is No, please answer no)
15.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	The family network and others were appropriately involved in the gathering of information. (Refer to #27 & #27a in review tool)
16.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	The family network and others were appropriately involved in developing Safety Plans if necessary. (Should be N/A if Safety Plan was not reviewed).
17.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	Policy and procedures related to safety intervention were followed. (Consider monthly contacts with child and parent (s). Supervisory Review; If #3 is No, please answer no)
18.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	Safety Plan is sufficient to protect child from threats of severe harm. (Supervisory Review; If #11 & #14 are no, please answer no)

Only complete if assessment was completed due to receipt of a new intake **OR** YLS indicated that a safety concern was present.

19.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	Efforts to coordinate with law enforcement were documented.
20.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	Interview protocols were followed or reasons for deviation were documented. (Refer to #7 & #8 in review tool)
21.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	The appropriate definition was used in making the case status determination.
22.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	The finding was correctly documented on N-FOCUS.
23.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	Factual information supports the selected finding.
24.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	Proof of certified notice to the alleged perpetrator is located in the file.