

## Statewide Comparison: August 2015 and February 2015 Review

August review: 307 cases pulled

February review: 234 cases pulled

August 2015 & February 2015 FAR Targeted Case	Result	Statewide: August 2015	Statewide: February 2015
	<p>1. Were actions taken to identify if the child(ren) had Indian ancestry? (Compliance) <a href="#">View Criteria</a></p>	<p><b>Full</b></p> <p><b>Partial</b></p> <p><b>Non</b></p> <p><b># Cases</b></p>	<p>51.1%</p> <p>21.8%</p> <p>27%</p> <p>307</p>
<p>2. If the parent or relative identified that the child(ren) had Indian ancestry with a federally recognized Tribe, was the Tribe(s) contacted to determine the child(ren)s Indian status? (Compliance) <a href="#">View Criteria</a></p>	<p><b>Full</b></p> <p><b>Partial</b></p> <p><b>Non</b></p> <p><b># Cases</b></p>	<p>70.7%</p> <p>4.9%</p> <p>24.4%</p> <p>41</p>	<p>68.2 %</p> <p>13.6 %</p> <p>18.2 %</p> <p>22</p>
<p>3. If the Tribe(s) confirmed the child was a member of or eligible for membership with a federally recognized Tribe, was there ongoing consultation and collaboration with the Tribe(s)? <i>(Applies to cases in which the federally recognized Tribe has confirmed the child's membership status. Consider whether the Tribe has indicated that they wish to formally intervene or participate informally.)</i> (Compliance) <a href="#">View Criteria</a></p>	<p><b>Full</b></p> <p><b>Partial</b></p> <p><b>Non</b></p> <p><b># Cases</b></p>	<p>72.7%</p> <p>9.1%</p> <p>18.2%</p> <p>11</p>	<p>75%</p> <p>0</p> <p>25%</p> <p>8%</p>
<p>4. If this was a Limited English Proficient (LEP) or American Sign Language (ASL) family, were translation and/or interpretive services provided? <i>(Translated documents include the FAR Family Agreement, safety plans, service referrals and letters and correspondence.)</i> (Compliance) <a href="#">View Criteria</a></p>	<p><b>Full</b></p> <p><b>Partial</b></p> <p><b>Non</b></p> <p><b># Cases</b></p>	<p>59.3%</p> <p>25.9%</p> <p>14.8%</p> <p>27</p>	<p>72.4 %</p> <p>13.8 %</p> <p>13.8 %</p> <p>29</p>

August 2015 & February 2015 FAR Targeted Case

Result	Statewide: August 2015	Statewide: February 2015
--------	---------------------------	-----------------------------

5. Was there adequate safety assessment and planning regarding other adults who resided in the parent/guardians home in a caregiver capacity to the child or with frequent unsupervised access to the child?

*(This applies to all cases where the child(ren) remained in the parent/guardian home, or visited the parent/guardian home when there were other adults in the home in a caregiver capacity to the child, or had frequent unsupervised access to the child.*

(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	53.8%	60.5 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	46.2%	39.5 %
<b># Cases</b>	210	172

6. Was safe sleep assessed and addressed if an infant was residing in the household?

*(This applies to cases with a child 12 months or younger residing in the parent/guardian household).*

(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	57.1%	58.3 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	42.9%	41.7 %
<b># Cases</b>	35	24

7. When there were indicators of domestic violence (DV), was there an adequate assessment of the child's safety related to DV and were appropriate services offered?

*(This applies to cases with children in the home when DV is relevant to the current family circumstances)*

(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	53.8%	56.9 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	46.2%	43.1 %
<b># Cases</b>	52	58

8. Was the parent/caregiver contacted in advance to arrange the initial meeting unless a significant safety concern required an unannounced home visit?

(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	80.5%	86.5 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	19.5%	13.5 %
<b># Cases</b>	302	229

9. Did the Initial Face-to-Face (IFF) contact with all child victims occur, or were sufficient attempts made, within the required 72 hour response time?

(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	94.7%	90.8 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	5.3%	9.2 %
<b># Cases</b>	304	228

August 2015 & February 2015 FAR Targeted Case

Result	Statewide: August 2015	Statewide: February 2015
--------	---------------------------	-----------------------------

10. When there was a supervisory extension or exception to the initial face-to-face contact (IFF), was the decision supported by policy, and did timely efforts to see the child(ren) occur?  
(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	68.5%	75.3 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	31.5%	24.7 %
<b># Cases</b>	54	73

11. Were interviews and observations with the child victim(s) sufficiently comprehensive?  
(Child victim interviews include the IFF and other child victim interviews completed during the FAR intervention.)  
(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	80.3%	81.1 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	19.7%	18.9 %
<b># Cases</b>	305	227

12. Were the parent/caregiver interviews sufficiently comprehensive?  
(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	79.7%	75.4 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	20.3%	24.6 %
<b># Cases</b>	306	224

13. Was information gathered from medical professionals to assist in the evaluation of suspected child abuse and neglect (CA/N), or to determine the need for medical treatment?  
(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	76.3%	62.9
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	23.7%	37.1
<b># Cases</b>	76	140

14. Were collateral contacts made with all important individuals who may have relevant information regarding child safety?  
(This excludes collateral contacts with medical professionals that were captured in the previous question.)  
(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	71.2%	65.8 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	28.8%	34.2 %
<b># Cases</b>	306	225

August 2015 & February 2015 FAR Targeted Case

Result	Statewide: August 2015	Statewide: February 2015
--------	---------------------------	-----------------------------

15. Was a Safety Assessment completed that accurately identified if the child was safe or unsafe?  
(Answer this question when sufficient information was gathered to determine if safety threats were present.)  
(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	87.6%	81.9 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	12.4%	18.1 %
<b># Cases</b>	290	216

16. If the child was unsafe and remained in the home, was an In-home Safety Plan developed?  
(Answer this question for an unsafe child who remained in the home during the FAR intervention, regardless of whether the Safety Assessment accurately identified the child as safe or unsafe.)  
(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	66.7%	72 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	33.3%	28 %
<b># Cases</b>	6	25

17. Did the In-home Safety Plan(s), developed by FAR, sufficiently address safety threats to children in the home?  
(Review to all In-Home Safety Plans developed by FAR during the last six months)  
(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	50%	50 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	50%	50 %
<b># Cases</b>	4	16

18. Did a shared planning meeting occur when required?  
(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	85.7%	81.8%
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	14.3%	18.2
<b># Cases</b>	14	22

19. Were there efforts to collaborate with the mother to assess the family's needs and identify appropriate services?  
(This includes the biological mother, stepmother or female guardian who reside in the household and may also include a non-custodial mother who has frequent contact with the child(ren).)  
(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	90.8%	84.2 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	9.2%	15.8 %
<b># Cases</b>	293	221

August 2015 & February 2015 FAR Targeted Case

Result	Statewide: August 2015	Statewide: February 2015
--------	---------------------------	-----------------------------

20. Were there efforts to collaborate with the father to assess the family’s needs and identify appropriate services?  
(This includes the biological father, stepfather or male guardian who reside in the household and may also include a non-custodial father who has frequent contact with the child(ren).  
(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	78.8%	67 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	21.2%	33 %
<b># Cases</b>	278	206

21. Was there a FAR Family Assessment that was sufficiently comprehensive to evaluate the family’s strengths and needs?  
(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	81.7%	73.4 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	18.3%	26.6 %
<b># Cases</b>	306	203

22. Was a case plan completed if necessary?  
(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	74.1%	65.8 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	25.9%	34.2 %
<b># Cases</b>	27	38

23. Was sufficient information gathered to answer each of the Structured Decision Making (SDM) questions and were the SDM questions answered accurately?  
(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	58.7%	74.8 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	41.3%	25.2 %
<b># Cases</b>	305	210

24. Were appropriate community services and concrete resources offered or provided to the family?  
(Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	84.8%	83.9 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	15.2	16.1 %
<b># Cases</b>	217	168

August 2015 & February 2015 FAR Targeted Case

Result	Statewide: August 2015	Statewide: February 2015
--------	---------------------------	-----------------------------

25. Was the FAR intervention sufficiently comprehensive to determine if all children were safe, and were all risk and safety threats adequately addressed? (Compliance) [View Criteria](#)

<b>Full</b>	75.8%	70.3 %
<b>Partial</b>	0	0
<b>Non</b>	24.2%	29.7 %
<b># Cases</b>	306	209

August 2015 & February 2015 FAR Targeted Case

**Result**

**Statewide:  
August 2015**

**Statewide:  
February 2015**