CPS Case Review Instrument: Assessments & Service Matching

Case will be identified from the M112 as CPS, APS.

December 1, 2018

General Case Instructions:

* Check box items are multi-select. The reviewer can make multiple selections if appropriate to the case specific circumstances.
* For state case reviews, reviewers may only make selections based on the information documented in either the hard copy file or the TWIST database.
* Some questions may have additional, question-specific instructions under the item.

Case Information

1) a)Case type:

* Investigation
* In-Home (Child in Own Home)
* In-Home (Parent Placed Child with Relative via Prevention Plan
* In-Home (Child Placed in Relative Custody)
* OOHC
* Status
* Agency

b) Was the most recent assessment:

* Investigative
* Ongoing
* Closing Ongoing

c) What is the area of greatest risk that prompted the most recent investigation or necessitated the case be opened:

* Physical Abuse
* Sexual Abuse
* Emotional Maltreatment
* Neglect (Not including Medical Neglect)
* Medical Neglect
* Abandonment
* Substance Impaired Caregiver
* Concurrent Violence
* Dependency
* Status Offender
* Other

Instruction: Reviewer should determine the greatest risk/case opening reason based on the documentation in the assessment not solely on the initial allegations.

2) a) Indicate the number of child household members in the child’s primary residences:

* 0
* 1
* 2
* 3
* 4
* more than 4
* unable to determine/lacks documentation

b) Indicate the number of adult household members in the child’s primary residence(s):

* 0
* 1
* 2
* 3
* 4
* more than 4
* unable to determine/lacks documentation

Initiation

3) Worker made face to face contact with victim per SOP?

* Yes
* No
* N/A – case was marked unable to locate
* N/A – There was no investigation during this review period

4) If contact was not made within SOP timeframes identify the barrier (mark all that apply):

* Inaccurate address received at intake
* Family not responsive to attempted home visits or phone calls
* Child out of town/out of state
* Child unable to be located at an educational facility (daycare, school, etc.) if applicable
* Child had no access to the perpetrator
* No documented barriers
* Assigned outside of timeframes
* N/A – contact was made timely
* N/A – There was no investigation during this period of review
* Collaterals were contacted but they were unable to assist with locating child/family

5) If contact was not made within SOP timeframes, what attempts were made to locate the child (mark all that apply):

* Multiple home visit attempts (check if it appears sufficient efforts to locate the family at the home were made)
* Phone contact attempts
* Mailed a certified letter
* Left a note with contact information at the family residence
* Family Support
* Child care agencies
* School system
* Court records
* Neighbors
* Family members
* Post office
* Landlords
* Family resource centers
* Law enforcement
* Other agencies that may be involved with the family
* Insufficient efforts made
* No efforts made
* Unable to assess from the documentation
* N/A – case was initiated timely
* N/A – There was no investigation during this period of review

6) Did the quality of the initiation ensure the child(ren) were safe? (i.e. just seeing a child doesn’t mean we have initiated and ensured safety)?

* Yes, the worker made contact and ensured safety by addressing the allegations and safety planning if appropriate
* No, the worker made contact but did not address all of the allegations
* No, the worker made contact but did not assess all of the children or household members
* No, the worker made contact but did not complete an appropriate safety plan if applicable
* Unable to assess from the documentation
* N/A – case was marked as unable to locate
* N/A – There was no investigation during this period of review

Engagement Questions

7) Identify which statements are true about the worker’s approach to the most recent service plan (a prevention plan, case plan or aftercare plan):

* Dictated service planning without involving family members in problem solving
* Involved the mother in decision-making
* Involved the father in decision-making
* Involved other household members/caretakers in decision making
* Involved the child in decision-making
* Worked with the family to resolve access issues
* Coordinated service plans to ensuring the service providers were working in concert with the goals of the child protection case
* N/A

Instruction: Reviewer can make more than one selection. Reviewer should consider if it is clear that the worker collaborated with the family in order to build partnership with the family and allow family to take ownership of the plan. For OOHC cases, reviewers should be considering the OOHC child involvement in the case plan. For in home cases, reviewers should consider the involvement of all the children for whom involvement would have been appropriate. Federal reviewers expect to see some involvement of any child that is school age unless there is a cognitive or physical reason why there participation would be inappropriate.

8) Identify which statements are true about the worker’s interactions with family members:

* Approaches the family in an overly authoritative manner
* Works punitively with the family
* Conveys disdain or condescension for family members
* Noticeably one-sided interactions with one or two household members only
* Encourages the family to communicate their concerns or issues
* Shows empathy for family members
* Remains respectful of family members
* Encourages family participation in case planning and decision-making
* Unable to assess from the documentation

Instruction: Reviewer should assess all available documentation including but not limited to assessments, case plans and contacts. Reviewer should consider the tone by which the worker documents the interactions in order to ascertain the over approach and engagement level with the family. Are all family members assessed equally? Does the documentation suggest worker is not vested in the success of the family?

9) Characterize the worker’s effectiveness with a resistant client (mark all that were true):

* Worker approach escalated resistance
* Worker remained respectful and self-controlled with a resistant client
* Worker effectively engaged resistance client
* N/A: There were no resistant clients in the case.
* Unable to assess from the documentation

Instruction: Reviewer should consider all available documentation in order to determine workers engagement with the client

Future Maltreatment Risk Assessment

10)Were all reports meeting abuse/neglect criteria received in the past 12 months formally assessed?

* Yes
* No, at least one report that met criteria was inappropriately rejected for assessment
* No, at least one report that met criteria was not reported
* No, at least one report that met criteria was informally assessed

Instruction: Reviewer should consider all documentation to determine if all allegations were appropriately reported and screened via the intake process.

11) In the most recent assessment, characterize the thoroughness of the assessment for household/family members:

Instruction: Formal assessments include both the ADT and the case plan evaluation. Reviewers may also consider assessment content in ongoing contacts.

* A “thorough” assessment will provide enough information for the reviewer to validate that the assessment is a reasonably complete picture of family functioning, high risk behaviors, parental capacity and vulnerability of children to make recommendations regarding case disposition and service planning.
* An “incident focused” assessment may provide detailed information about the incident that led to agency involvement in preparation only for service planning around that incident only.
* An assessment that is missing essential information may provide detailed, but superficial or irrelevant information that is irrelevant or incomplete related to the either the incident or a risk assessment sufficient for service planning.
* “Was not assessed” should be utilized when the information is entirely lacking.

1. Mother
   1. Health and cognitive functioning
   2. Tendency to engage in violence
   3. Tendency to abuse substances
   4. Tendency to be overwhelmed with daily tasks
   5. Effectiveness of parenting skills
   6. Willingness to prioritize the child’s safety

Values for questions 7 & 9:

* Thorough
* Incident focused
* Missing essential information
* Was not assessed
* N/A (Reviewers can use N/A with any case individual; however, when using N/A for biological parents, the reviewer may not select this value unless the parent is deceased, absent despite the workers documented attempts to locate and engage, if a waiver or efforts has been granted, or if the case is 30 days past TPR with no appeal pending.)

1. Father
   1. Health and cognitive functioning
   2. Tendency to engage in violence
   3. Tendency to abuse substances
   4. Tendency to be overwhelmed with daily tasks
   5. Effectiveness of parenting skills
   6. Willingness to prioritize the child’s safety
2. Maternal spouse/paramour
3. Health and cognitive functioning
4. Tendency to engage in violence
5. Tendency to abuse substances
6. Tendency to be overwhelmed with daily tasks
7. Effectiveness of parenting skills
8. Willingness to prioritize the child’s safety
9. Paternal spouse/paramour
   1. Health and cognitive functioning
   2. Tendency to engage in violence
   3. Tendency to abuse substances
   4. Tendency to be overwhelmed with daily tasks
   5. Effectiveness of parenting skills
   6. Willingness to prioritize the child’s safety
10. Status offender
    1. Health and cognitive functioning
    2. Tendency to engage in violence
    3. Tendency to abuse substances
11. Other household members
    1. Health and cognitive functioning
    2. Tendency to engage in violence
    3. Tendency to abuse substances
    4. Tendency to be overwhelmed with daily tasks
    5. Effectiveness of parenting skills
    6. Willingness to prioritize the child’s safety

12) Please characterize the thoroughness of the assessment of the child(children):

* Yes, the child vulnerability was thoroughly assessed
* No, the child’s age and developmental status were not assessed
* No, the child’s physical health was not assessed
* No, the child’s mental/behavioral health was not assessed
* No the child’s educational needs were not assessed

Instruction: For in home cases, reviewers should consider all the children in the family and consider what elements of child vulnerability are relevant to the agency’s involvement. For OOHC cases, reviewers should consider the target child and ensure appropriate content in each of the required elements: physical (including dental) and behavioral health, mental and behavioral health, the child’s educational statute and the child’s overall vulnerability.

13) Please characterize the thoroughness of the assessment in the following sub-categories of family functioning:

* 1. Stability of family life and family interactions
  2. Family systems of support
  3. Cultural influences/issues

Instruction: Reviewers should consider whether the worker updated the information appropriately in light of any changes in the family structure (divorce, birth, death etc.). Does the worker note whether there are high-risk developmental issues or cultural issues? Does the worker highlight family strengths in this section? Does the worker note any changes in this assessment area as a result of intervention or any new areas of concern? Reviewers should consider whether or not there is a continuity of information between the current assessment and previous assessments, i.e. were areas of concern from the last assessment addressed with an update in the current assessment—noting progress or a lack of progress in any area.

14) Was information from collateral interviews or collateral source information included in the assessment?

* Yes
* No
* N/A

15) Was information in the assessment collected from objective sources of information or verified by objective sources of information?

* Yes
* No
* N/A

Instruction: Reviewer should consider if the worker followed up with service providers, medical professionals etc. Were records gathered and included in the assessment? Did worker seek out collateral information from parties other than those with a potential agenda in the case?

16) Did the assessment accurately assess all the risk and safety concerns for the target child/children?

* Yes
* No, there were risks that were not appropriately assessed
* No, there were safety issues that were not appropriately assessed

Instruction: Reviewers should consider whether or not the worker describes the risk or situation that brought the family into contact with the agency. Does the worker summarize the family’s progress in reducing risk? Does the worker summarize whether or not there is a continued need for ongoing services, indicating the presence or absence of any new incidents of maltreatment.

Service Planning

17) Indicate most recent service plan for your review as a:

* prevention plan
* case plan
* aftercare plan
* N/A (a service plan was not required based on the case disposition)

18) In the most recent service plan negotiated during the review period, was it appropriate to the individuals high risk patterns indicated in the most recent assessment?

Subcategories: Mother/Father/Other household member

* + Yes
  + No, services were not matched to the parenting skills needs
  + No, services were not matched to mental or behavioral health needs
  + No, services were not matched to address substance abuse
  + No services were not matched to address family violence
  + N/A, the individual is not an active service plan participant

Instruction: Are there appropriate and specific tasks and objectives that are designed in order to reduce high risk behaviors? \*\*“N/A” can be used for “other household members” if there are none involved in the case. “N/A” can only be used for parents when the parent is deceased, absent despite the workers documented attempts to locate and engage, if a waiver of efforts has been granted, or if the case is 30 days past TPR with no appeal pending.

19) In the most recent service plan negotiated during the period under review, was it appropriate to the child or youth needs identified during the assessment?

* + Yes
  + No, services were not matched to the child’s developmental needs
  + No, services were not matched to the child’s physical health needs,
  + No, services were not matched to the child’s dental health needs,
  + No, services were not matched to the child’s mental or behavioral health needs,
  + No, services were not matched to address the child’s substance abuse
  + No, services were not matched to address the child’s violence
  + N/A, the individual is deceased

Instruction: Reviewer should ensure the objectives and tasks identify services or tasks that will match the identified needs of the child. For in home cases, reviewers should assessment the question as it relates to all children. For OOHC cases, reviewers should read with the target child in mind.

20) Based on the most recent service plan (prevention plan, case plan, aftercare plan), if there was an issue in matching services to needs, select the reason below:

* Family was routed to a program that did not match to their area of greatest risk
* Family was routed to too many services to be meaningful to their area of greatest risk
* Family’s area of greatest risk was not identified by the worker
* Family’s area of greatest risk was not matched to a service
* The best match of service is not available in the community
* A lack of transportation affected service accessibility
* Waiting lists affected service accessibility
* A lack of insurance or inability to pay affected service availability
* N/A: The service matching was appropriate
* N/A: Both parents were absent, despite the workers efforts as documented in the case
* N/A: Both parents were uncooperative, despite the workers efforts as documented in the case

Instruction: N/A options should only be selected if the worker has clearly documented that the conditions are present in the case.

21) Does the documentation reflect that worker contact with the case participants was of sufficient frequency and quality to address key issues pertaining to needs, services and/or case goals?

1. Mother
2. Father
3. Maternal spouse/paramour
4. Paternal spouse/paramour
5. Relative placement providers
6. DCBS resource parents
7. Private placing agency
8. Residential placement providers
9. Other placement providers
10. Other household members
11. Service providers

Values for a) through j)

* Yes
* No, the frequency was not sufficient to provide ongoing monitoring of risks and safety, or progress toward case goals.
* No, the quality as not sufficient to provide ongoing monitoring of risks and safety, or progress toward case goals.
* Client’s non-compliance affected frequency
* Client’s non-compliance affected quality
* N/A (Reviewers can use N/A with any case individual; however, when using N/A for biological parents, the reviewer may not select this value unless the parent is deceased, absent despite the workers documented attempts to locate and engage, if a waiver of efforts has been granted, or if the case is 30 days past TPR with no appeal pending.)

Instruction: Reviewer should consider the overall pattern of visits, and determine whether the overall pattern is sufficient to the case specific circumstances.

22) Does the documentation reflect that worker contact with the child was of sufficient frequency and quality to address key issues pertaining to needs, services and/or case goals?

* Yes
* No, the frequency was not sufficient to provide ongoing monitoring of risks and safety, or progress toward case goals.
* No, the quality as not sufficient to provide ongoing monitoring of risks and safety, or progress toward case goals.
* No, the child welfare agency did not provide oversight of prescription medicines for a child in OOHC.
* Child’s non-compliance affected frequency
* Child’s non-compliance affected quality
* N/A

Instruction: Reviewer should consider the overall pattern of visits, and determine whether the overall pattern is sufficient to the case specific circumstances.

23) During the period under review, was there evidence of reduced risk in the home?

* Yes
* No, the lack of appropriate community services affected the family’s success
* No, the risk was not reduced due to the family’s lack of progress
* No, the family’s unwillingness to cooperate affected the family’s success
* N/A, this is an agency case

Instruction: Reviewer should consider if the original high-risk patterns identified (as well as any additional behaviors identified during the service provision) were not only reduced and evidenced by behavioral changes.

Comments: Open comments about the quality of case work

24) If the child is Native American, were ICWA requirements met?

* Yes
* No, the child affiliation was not assessed
* No, the child entered the state’s custody and efforts were not made to place the child accordance with ICWA placement preference
* No, the tribe was not provided timely notice of its right to intervene in state proceedings
* N/A

Instruction: N/A can only be selected if it is clearly documented that Native American affiliation was assessed and the child was determined not to be of Native American heritage.

25) Was the most recent permanency goal appropriate to the needs of the child and the circumstances of the case?

* Yes
* No

26) If the child is not placed in the same community from where he/she was removed, indicate the reasons why:

* N/A
* Least restrictive placement is not within proximity of the child’s former community
* Family members targeted for reasonable efforts are not within the proximity of the child’s former community
* Unable to determine/lack of documentation

27) Is the child’s current placement stable/expected to last until the child achieves permanency?

* Yes
* No, the placement is not a good match to the child’s needs
* No, there are safety concerns regarding the placement
* No, the child’s needs require a short-term restrictive placement
* Other:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

28) If the child and siblings are not together, is there clear documentation that separation is necessary to meet the needs of the child?

* Yes
* No
* N/A

Instruction: Reviewers should also consider that the documentation indicates that separation was necessary to meet the needs of one of the children, i.e. separation was necessary to permit a child to be placed with their paternal relatives, to address safety issues, or to accommodate specific treatment needs of one of the children.

Reviewers rate “no” if the separation was the result of inadequate OOHC placements to meet the needs of a sibling group. Reviewers also consider whether the reasons for separation still exist during the period under review, i.e. if children were separated for specialized treatment, have there been appropriate efforts to reunify the children?

29) The child’s most recent OOHC case plan incorporates appropriate information regarding the child’s physical, dental and behavioral health:

Subcategories: Physical/Dental/Behavioral Health

* Yes
* No, the child’s health providers names and addresses were omitted
* No, the child’s immunization record was omitted (not applicable under dental/behavioral health subcategories)
* No, the child’s known diagnoses/problems were omitted
* No the child’s medications were omitted
* No, other relevant health information was omitted
* No, an appropriate provider was not available to meet the child’s specific needs

Instruction: Reviewer should only select yes if all areas are documented and/or incorporated into the case plan.

30) The child’s most recent OOHC case plan incorporates educational information pertinent to the child:

* Yes
* No, the child’s educational needs were not assessed
* No, services were not provided to meet the child’s educational needs
* No, the child’s education providers names and addresses were omitted
* No, the child’s grade level performance was omitted
* No, other relevant educational information was omitted

Instruction: Reviewer should only select yes if educational needs are identified and documented and/or incorporated into the case plan. All relevant selections should be checked.

31) Did the department made adequate efforts to facilitate the involvement of the mother?

* Yes
* No, the mother was not provided a visitation agreement that is sufficient to promote attachment and continuity of the relationship
* No, the child’s placement was not established in close proximity to the mother
* No, the mother was not encouraged to participate in school or after-school activities, medical appointments and special events
* No, transportation was not facilitated so that the mother can participate in events, activities or appointments
* No, the mother was not provided opportunities for family therapeutic interaction?
* No, contact was not facilitated with an incarcerated mother or one residing far from the child?
* N/A, the parent is deceased, absent despite the workers documented efforts to locate/engage, if a waiver of efforts has been granted, or if the case is 30 days past TPR with no appeal pending

Instruction: Reviewer should select all relevant options. Reviewer should not select yes when any of the other options are selected.

32) Did the department make adequate efforts to facilitate the involvement of the father?

* Yes
* No, the father was not provided a visitation agreement that is sufficient to promote attachment and continuity of the relationship
* No, the child’s placement was not established in close proximity to the father
* No, the father was not encouraged to participate in school or after-school activities, medical appointments and special events
* No, transportation was not facilitated so that the father can participate in events, activities or appointments
* No, the father was not provided opportunities for family therapeutic interaction?
* No, contact was not facilitated with an incarcerated father or one residing far from the child?
* N/A, the parent is deceased, absent despite the workers documented efforts to locate/engage, if a waiver of efforts has been granted, or if the case is 30 days past TPR with no appeal pending

Instruction: Reviewer should select all relevant options. Reviewer should not select yes when any of the other options are selected.

33) Visits with parents, siblings, and other significant persons in the child’s life is safe AND of sufficient frequency and quality to maintain or promote continuity of the relationship:

Subcategories: Mother/Father/Sibling/Other Significant Person

* Agree
* No, the frequency of contact is insufficient
* No, the quality of contact is insufficient
* No, there are unaddressed safety issues associated with current visitation.
* N/A (Reviewers can use N/A with any case individual; however, when using N/A for biological parents, the reviewer may not select this value unless the parent is deceased, absent despite the workers documented attempts to locate and engage, if a waiver or efforts has been granted, or if the case is 30 days past TPR with no appeal pending.)

34) An absent parent search was completed

* Yes
* No
* N/A

35) Did the agency make concerted efforts to place the child with a relative?

* Yes, the child was placed with a relative
* Yes, the worker made concerted efforts to identify and assess relatives, but those relatives were ruled out or unwilling to serve as a placement
* No, concerted efforts were not made to identify maternal relatives
* No, concerted efforts were not made to identify paternal relatives
* No, maternal relatives were not assessed for placement
* No, paternal relatives were not assessed for placement
* No, appropriate maternal relatives were not utilized
* No, appropriate paternal relatives not utilized

Instruction: Reviewer should check all relevant boxes. I.e. Child could be placed with a maternal relative however no paternal relatives were identified or considered for placement.

36) Adequate services were arranged to support the placement provider’s needs?

* Yes
* No, the provider’s needs were not assessed
* No, services were not provided to meet the providers needs

Instruction: Reviewer should make certain that when answering yes, the needs were identified, documented and relevant services were provided.

37) Characterize what best characterizes the most recent move in the period under review:

* A less restrictive placement
* A placement in closer proximity to the target of reasonable efforts for reunification or permanent placement
* A placement to reunify with a sibling or siblings
* A disruption
* A more restrictive placement
* N/A

Instruction: Reviewer should consider the information in the enter/exit screens as well as information documented in contacts and the most recent assessment or case plan.

38) Has a waiver of efforts been requested in court?

* Yes
* No
* N/A, the child has exited to a parent or relative
* N/A, aggravated circumstances are not present
* N/A, the case is post TPR

39) For a child in care for more than 15 months indicate:

* A pre-permanency conference has been held.
* An ASFA exception has been documented.
* A voluntary termination of parental rights has been discussed with the parent(s).
* The termination of parental rights was filed timely.
* The case is post TPR.
* N/A, the child has not been in care for 15 months
* N/A, the child has exited to a parent or relative
* N/A, the child has exited to adoption
* N/A, the child has exited to adulthood

Instruction: Reviewer should select all applicable options. A selection should only be made if there is written documentation found in the case file/TWIST review.

40) Child specific recruitment efforts are documented sufficiently in the case record

* Yes
* No
* N/A, the goal is return to parent and that goal is appropriate to the case specific circumstances
* N/A, the child has exited to a parent or relative
* N/A, the child exited to adoption

Instruction: Reviewer should determine that if an adoption goal is appropriate has the worker made regular attempts to locate and maintain an adoptive placement for the identified youth.

41) If an adoption was not finalized in 24 months, please indicate any applicable description of the agency and courts concerted efforts to achieve permanency:

* The child exited to a parent or relative
* The child exited to adulthood
* The goal for the child is PPLA, and that goal is appropriate to the case specific circumstances
* Termination paperwork was not filed in the 15th month of the child’s OOHC episode
* No home was identified at TPR
* The court declined to grant TPR
* Extended subsidy negotiations
* Not Documented
* Other: Blank Text Field

42) Did the worker include a completed DPP-165 Notification of Permanency Hearing in the case record?

* Yes
* No
* Not Applicable