Initial Safety Assessments – Round 4 Safety Model QA Results

Number of Reviews: *638 or 11.8% eligible Initial Safety Assessments were reviewed in the State*

Review Periods: *October 1, 2009 – March 31, 2010*

Review Results: Green indicates 90% and above, yellow 75 – 89% and red 74% and below

Safety QA - Questions	Achieved Percentage
Initial Response:	
Initial contact with all child victims was made within the required time frame	68%
Other children residing in the home were interviewed	77%
Reason for not interviewing the other children in the home was contained within the documentation	19%
Other adults living in the home were interviewed	46%
The non maltreating caregiver was interviewed during the assessment	89%
The maltreating caregiver was interviewed	90%
Interview protocol was followed	34%
Documentation for the deviation from the interview protocol	14%
Present Danger & Immediate Protective Action:	
Worker identified Present Danger during contacts with the child and/or family	3%
Reviewer agreed with the worker's assessment of Present Danger	98%
Immediate Protective Action (IPA) plan was implemented for cases that identified Present Danger	56%
Documentation indicated the reason for IPA was explained to the parent/caregiver	80%
IPA included a provision for oversight	100%
Oversight requirement was sufficient to assure that the IPA was implemented in accordance to assure child safety	40%
Oversight plan was followed by the worker or other designated person	70%
IPA contained the parent's willingness to cooperate	70%
IPA contained the description of person (s) responsible for protection action	80%
IPA contained confirmation of person responsible for protective action: trustworthiness, reliability, commitment, availability and alliance to plan	70%
IPA contained a description of how it will all work	20%
IPA contained time frames	30%
IPA were sufficient	70%
6 Domains/Collateral Info/Identification of Relatives/ICWA:	
Sufficient information was documented in the Maltreatment domain.	81%
Sufficient information was documented in the Nature domain	60%
Sufficient information was documented in the Child Functioning domain	66%
Sufficient information was documented in the Parenting Discipline domain	48%
Sufficient information was documented in the General Parenting domain	49%
Sufficient information was documented the Adult Functioning domain	41%
Collateral information was incorporated when necessary	41%
Worker identified maternal relatives	62%
Worker identified paternal relatives	46%
ICWA information was obtained	77%

Statewide Initial Safety Assessment QA Reviews – Round 4 table

Safety Evaluation:	
Documentation was sufficient to provide a reasonable understanding of family members and their functioning	37%
Documentation was sufficient to support and justify decision making	38%
Documentation was sufficient in the 6 domains to accurately assess the 14 safety factors	37%
Reviewer agreed with worker on safety threats – safety factors marked "YES"	82%
Safety factors marked "yes", documentation contained a justification for the identification of impending danger	76%
Reviewer agreed with worker on safety factors marked "NO"	37%
Reviewer agreed with the worker's conclusion that the child was safe	40%
Reviewer agreed with the worker's conclusion that the child was unsafe	92%
Safety Plan:	
Reviewer judged the overall Safety Plan to be sufficient	12%
Suitability of Safety Plan participant was sufficient	83%
Safety Plan oversight was sufficient	47%
Contingency plan was appropriate	31%
Safety Plan contained promissory commitments. * Lower number is better.	27%
Protective Capacity Assessment:	
Protective Capacity Assessment was conducted	38%
PCA documentation reflects consensus between the worker and the family	66%
PCA identified enhanced protective capacities	89%
Conditions of Return:	
COR was established for children in out of home care at the end of the assessment	49%
COR included how an in home Safety Plan would keep the child safe	94%

Statewide Initial Safety Assessment QA Reviews – Round 4 table