IA 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 Administrator and the Safety QA 2nd Level Reviewer.

General Information	
Review Date	
Reviewer	
Service Area	
Local Office	
Supervisor	
IA Worker	
Intake Number	
Date Intake Received	

Initial Response/Contact Information

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

2. **What was the priority of the Intake?**
   ☐ Priority 1
   ☐ Priority 2
   ☐ Priority 3
   ☐ NA, not an intake

	Y	N	NA
3. 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.

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

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.

	Y	N	NA
4a. 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?	☐	☐	☐

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Y	N	NA
8. Was the interview protocol followed? ***(if yes skip to 10)***	☐	☐	☐

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.

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

Present Danger/Protective Action (Initial Contact)

	Y	N
10. Did the worker identify present danger at the initial contact with the child victim and/or family?	☐	☐

	Y	N
11. Does the reviewer agree with the worker's assessment of present danger at the initial contact?	☐	☐

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
12. If present danger was identified was an Immediate Protective Action taken?	☐	☐	☐

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

	Y	N	NA
13. 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
14. Did the Protective Action include a provision for oversight? ***(if Yes, continue to 14a, if No or NA continue to 15)***	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
NA is warranted when no present danger exists.

	Y	N	NA
14a. **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.

	Y	N	NA
15. Did the worker (or other designated person) follow the plan for oversight of the Protective Action?	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
NA is warranted when no present danger exists.

16. Did the protective action contain the following?	Y	N	NA
Yes ☐ **No** ☐ **Parent's willingness to cooperate.**	☐	☐	☐
Yes ☐ **No** ☐ **Description of person(s) responsible for the protective action. (protective caregiver)**			
Yes ☐ **No** ☐ **Confirmation of person responsible for protective action: trustworthiness, reliability, commitment, availability, and alliance to plan.**			
Yes ☐ **No** ☐ **Description of protective action: how it will work**			
Yes ☐ **No** ☐ **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.

17. 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.

	Y	N
18. Did the worker identify impending danger at the initial contact?	☐	☐

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 PS 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 PS safety intervention, severe harm is probable in the near future.

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

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 PS 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 PS 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.

6 Domains, Safety Evaluation, Impending Danger

	Y	N
20. 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. Information must be located in the correct domain.

21. Was sufficient information collected regarding the nature of maltreatment?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

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. Information must be located in the correct domain.

22. Was sufficient information collected regarding child functioning?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

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. Information must be located in the correct domain.

23. Was sufficient information collected regarding 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. Information must included in the correct domain.

24. Was sufficient information collected regarding 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. Information must be included in the correct domain.

25. Was sufficient information collected regarding 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 . Information must be included in the correct domain.

26. Was there indication that information should have been collected from a collateral source? ***(if yes, continue to 26a, if no, skip to 27)***	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐
26a. Was the collateral information collected?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

27. Did the worker identify maternal relatives?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

28. Did the worker identify paternal relatives?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

29. Was information obtained regarding ICWA?	**Y** ☐	**N** ☐

30. 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

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

32. 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.

33. 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.

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

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

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

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. These five factors must be documented in order to get credit for the justification.

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.

	Y	N	NA
36. Reviewer agrees with the worker's conclusion that the child is safe?	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
NA is warranted if the worker did not conclude the child is safe.

	Y	N	NA
37. Reviewer agrees with the worker's conclusion that the child is unsafe?	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
NA is warranted if the worker did not conclude the child is unsafe.

Safety Plan

	Y	N
38. Did the worker determine that the child was unsafe and a safety plan was necessary?	☐	☐

	Y	N
39. Did the reviewer determine that child was safe and a safety		

plan was not necessary?	☐	☐

	Y	N	NA
40.Did the Immediate Protective Action remain in effect up to the conclusion of the initial safety assessment? *(NA if there was not an immediate Protective Action.)*	☐	☐	☐

	Y	N
41.Was a safety plan established at the conclusion of the safety assessment? *(If no, stop)*	☐	☐

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

	Y	N	NA
43. 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
44. 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
45. If a combination safety plan was not utilized, should the worker have utilized one? *(NA if a combination safety plan was completed)*	☐	☐	☐

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

	Y	N	NA
47. 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
48. Did the safety plan contain a contingency plan? *If no, skip to Question 50*	☐	☐

	Y	N
49. Did the reviewer judge the contingency plan to be appropriate?	☐	☐

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

	Y	N
51. 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 the safety plan participants the answer is "N" for no.)*	☐	☐

52. 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.

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

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.

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

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

56. Did the safety plan include a provision for oversight? *(If yes, continue to 56 a, if no or NA, skip to 58.)*	Y	N	NA
	☐	☐	☐

56a. Was the oversight requirement sufficient to assure that the safety plan was implemented in accordance with expectation and was assuring child safety?	Y	N	NA
	☐	☐	☐

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

Protective Capacity Assessment

58. Was a Protective Capacity Assessment Conducted? *(If yes continue to 59, if no skip to 61)*	Y	N
	☐	☐

	Y	N
59. Does documentation reflect that a consensus was reached between the worker and the family about what must change?	☐	☐

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

Conditions for Return

	Y	N	NA
61. Were conditions for return established?	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
NA is warranted when the child was not removed.

	Y	N	NA
62. 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?	☐	☐	☐

Instructions:
NA is warranted when the child was not removed. ***If 61 is no then 62 is NA.***

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 were met. *(Supervisory Review; consider Question 3 within the review tool)*
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 Question 29 within the review tool)*
9.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	Information was obtained about non-custodial parent, relatives, and other family supports. *(Refer to Questions 27 &28 within the review tool.*
10.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	An immediate Protective Action was appropriately implemented to assure child safety.

For cases involving allegations of maltreatment:

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; Consider If #1 when answering)*
13.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	A Protective Action was documented in accordance with required practice. *(Supervisory Review; Consider #10 when answering)*
14.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	A Safety Plan was documented in accordance with required practice. *(Supervisory Review; Consider #11 when answering)*
15.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	The family network and others were appropriately involved in the gathering of information. *(Refer to #26-26a in the review tool)*
16.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	The family network and others were appropriately involved in developing Safety Plans if necessary.
17.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	Policy and procedures related to safety intervention were followed. *(Supervisory Review;Consider # 3 when answering)*
18.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA	Safety Plan is sufficient to protect child from threats of severe harm. *(Supervisory Review; Consider #11 & 14 when answering)*
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 Questions 8 & 9 in the 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. *(At this time QA reviewers do not review hard copy files and this question should be N/A).*