

Department of Children's Services
INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE OF FORM
CS-1111
Office of Child Safety Quality Assurance Review

A. Demographics:

Case Name

Enter the name (*Last Name, First Name*) that TFACTS uses to identify the investigation.

Investigation ID

Enter the Investigation ID that TFACTS has assigned to the investigation.

Review Period

Using calendar year, enter the quarter period and year (Q# 20##) of when the review was conducted.

Quarter 1 (January – March)

Quarter 2 (April – June)

Quarter 3 (July – September)

Quarter 4 (October – December)

Region

Enter the name of the region.

Team Leader

Enter the name of the Team Leader responsible for the investigation.

Case Manager

Enter the name of the Case Manager that closed the investigation.

B. Quantitative Checklist:

1. Was CPIT notified/convened?

- Answer “yes” if the documentation indicates that the Child Protective Investigative Team was notified in accordance with policy. Refer to **DCS Policy 14.6, 14.7** and local protocols for clarification of CPIT notification requirements.
- Answer “no” if the documentation indicates that the Child Protective Investigative Team was not notified in accordance with policy.
- Answer “not applicable” if the investigation did not require CPIT notification.
- If there was a delay (beyond what is expected for the circumstances of the specific case) in notification, note this in the comment section.
- TFACTS Location(s): Case Recordings under Case Summary, Notation, Admin Review or CPIT contact type

2. Was CPIT Review form ([CS-0561](#)) uploaded into TFACTS?

- Answer “yes” if the CPIT Review form is uploaded. Refer to Policy 14.6 and local protocols.
- Answer “no” if the CPIT Review form was not uploaded in accordance with policy.
- Answer “not applicable” if the investigation did not require CPIT involvement.
- If there was a delay (beyond what is expected for the circumstances of the specific case) in notification, note this in the comment section.

3. Was the District Attorney notified of both case initiation and closure?

- Answer “yes” if the documentation reflects that the local District Attorney was notified or will be notified per local protocol of a severe abuse investigation at both the initiation and closure of the case. Refer to DCS Policy 14.6, 14.7 and local protocols for clarification of the notification requirements.
- Answer “no” if the local District Attorney was not notified of a severe abuse investigation at both the initiation and closure of the case. If only one notification was made, answer “no” and make a note in the comment section for which notification was made.
- Answer “not applicable” if the District Attorney was not required to be notified of the investigation initiation or closure.
- TFACTS Location(s): Case Recordings under Case Summary, Notation, Admin Review or CPIT contact type

4. Was the local Juvenile Court Judge notified of both case initiation and closure?

- Answer “yes” if documentation reflects that the local Juvenile Court Judge was notified or will be notified per local protocols of both the case initiation and case closure. Refer to DCS Policies 14.6 & 14.7 and local protocols for clarification of requirements for notification to the local Juvenile Court Judge.
- Answer “no” if the local Juvenile Court Judge was not notified of both the initiation and closure of an investigation. If only one of the notifications were made, answer “no” and note in the comment section which notification was made.
- TFACTS Location(s): Case Recordings under Case Summary, Notation, or Admin Review contact type

5. Did a home visit occur or were good faith efforts made?

- Answer “yes” if documentation reflects that there was a home visit made or there were good faith efforts made in accordance with policy. Refer to [Child Protective Services Tasks Manual](#) for requirements regarding conducting a home visit.
- Answer “no” if a home visit was not conducted and the good faith efforts were not made as required.
- Answer “not applicable” if there are circumstances when a home visit isn’t appropriate. Note the reasons in the comment section.

- TFACTS Location(s): Case Recordings under Initial ACV Face to Face, ACV Interview/Observation, Parent/Caretaker Interview, Alleged Perpetrator Interview, Notation or Good Faith Effort contact type

6. *Were all siblings interviewed and/or observed?*

- Answer “yes” if documentation reflects that all siblings were interviewed and/or observed.
- Answer “no” if interviews were not conducted with all siblings. When partial compliance with this requirement occurs, answer the question “no” and note who was not interviewed in the comment section.
- Answer “not applicable” when there are no siblings or sibling interviews were not required for the investigation.
- TFACTS Location(s): Case Recordings under Sibling Interview/Observation or Other Child Living in the Home Interview/Observation contact type

7. *Was a Plan of Safe Care created for infants affected by substance abuse, withdrawal symptoms or Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder?*

- Answer “yes” if TFACTS reflects that a Plan of Safe Care was created for infants affected by substance abuse, withdrawal symptoms or Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder.
- Answer “no” if TFACTS does not reflect that a Plan of Safe Care was created by infants affected by substance abuse, withdrawal symptoms or Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder.
- Answer “Not Applicable” when the investigation does not involve infants affected by substance abuse, withdrawal symptoms or Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder.
- TFACTS Location(s): Person Home Page under Electronic Case File-Permanency Plan and Case Recordings under ACV Interview/Observation, Parent Caretaker Interview, Notation contact type
- TFACTS Location(s): Case Recordings under Initial ACV Face to Face, ACV Interview/Observation or Good Faith Effort contact type

C. Qualitative Findings:

Using the prompts listed and/or other indicators that are not listed, determine the expectation level that was met in Case Recordings’ Documentation which adequately reflects the level of competency in each of the following six areas of the investigation: 1) Quality Documentation 2) Assessment of Safety 3) Assessment of Risks 4) Effective Engagement with Child & Family 5) Identifies Services Appropriately & Timely and 6) Evidence Supports Allegation Classification. The lists provided are only examples of what may be found within Case Recordings’ Documentation to indicate competency in the specified area and are not to be considered all-inclusive or required in every situation.

For each rating given, provide a justification narrative using specific examples from the Case Recordings’ Documentation or indicating the absence of those examples. **Justification narratives are required for ratings in this section.**

Explanation of Ratings:

Exceeds Expectation – the reviewer has determined that the documentation goes above and beyond the minimal requirements and provides rich and substantive content.

Meets Expectation – the reviewer has determined that the documentation meets the requirements of policy and provides enough detail to assess the area reviewed.

Needs Improvement – the reviewer has determined that the documentation has not met the requirements of policy and/or lacks the needed information to assess the area reviewed.

Unacceptable – the reviewer has determined that the documentation fails to provide any valuable information to assess the area reviewed.

Examples of Justification for Ratings:

Assessment of Safety

Rating-Meets Expectations

Justification for Rating-

The Investigator described the home environment in detail, noted a broken window and took photos of the home. The Investigator also followed up with the family to ensure that the broken window was replaced. The initial ACV interview was timely and the physical description of the child was very detailed. The Safety Assessment was completed timely and captured the substance abuse and domestic violence concerns that were obtained during the parent and ACV interviews. The Investigator addressed the substance abuse and domestic violence issues with the parents in a CFTM and noted that the father was in denial and not willing to complete an alcohol and drug assessment. There was documentation of a legal consult regarding the father's unwillingness to participate with services.

Assessment of Risks

Rating-Needs Improvement

Justification for Rating-

Substance abuse and domestic violence issues were documented in the ACV and parent interviews but were not captured on the FAST. The ACV and parents' interviews were completed timely, but the interviews were very vague and only discussed the allegation listed in the referral. The Investigator did not note any criminal or DCS history for the family, but the parents reportedly had a child removed from the home 2 years ago due to domestic violence as well as the fact that the father participated in alcohol and drug treatment in the past. During witness interviews with school personnel it was reported that the ACV was "rough" with other children at school, but the Investigator did not follow up on these statements with the child or parents. Because of this there was a missed opportunity to consult with the regional educational specialist.